

MAY 1954

the christian SCHOLAR

The Quarterly Journal of the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America



An International Issue. Articles by John Coleman, Ronald H. Preston, Charles West, Mikio Sumiya, Paul J. Braisted and others. Theology of Education by J. V. Langmead Casserley. Reviews and Reports on University Concerns by Regions of the World.

Volume xxxvii Number 2 June 1954 A.D.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

36 East Main Street, Somerville, New Jersey
Quarterly Publication of
Commission on Christian Higher Education
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.
257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York
(Continuing the former quarterly journal, *Christian Education*)

J. Edward Dirks, Editor

EDITORIAL BOARD

Bernhard W. Anderson
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School
Rochester, New York

Douglas M. Knight, President
Lawrence College
Appleton, Wisconsin

Gerald E. Knoff, Executive Secretary
Division of Christian Education, National
Council of Churches
New York, New York

Raymond F. McLain, General Director
Commission on Christian Higher Education
National Council of Churches
New York, New York

Bernard J. Mulder, General Secretary
Board of Education
Reformed Church in America
New York, New York

William G. Pollard, Executive Director
Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies
Oak Ridge, Tennessee

William H. Poteat
Department of Philosophy
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

William Savage, Religious Editor
Charles Scribner's Sons
New York, New York

Seymour A. Smith
Religion in Higher Education
Yale Divinity School
New Haven, Connecticut

Ordway Tead, Editor
Social and Economic Books
Harper & Brothers
New York, New York

Andrew G. Truxal, President
Hood College
Frederick, Maryland

Ruth Wick, Executive Secretary
United Student Christian Council
New York, New York

Walter E. Wiest
Counselor to Protestant Students
Columbia University
New York, New York

Registered as second-class matter June, 1953, at the Post Office at Somerville, N. J., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Request for reentry at Somerville, N. J., is pending. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$3.00 per annum. Single copies, regular issue, 75 cents.

The cover was designed by Joseph G. Graves; original woodcuts were made by Fritz Kredel; type is American Uscial designed by Victor Hammer; and, it was printed at the Ram Press.

The Christian Scholar

VOLUME XXXVII

NUMBER 2

JUNE, 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
The Editor's Preface	87
THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN THE UNIVERSITY ... <i>A. John Coleman</i>	92
IS THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION DEAD? <i>Ronald H. Preston</i>	96
GENERAL STUDIES IN GERMANY TODAY <i>Werner Phillip</i>	101
THE CHRISTIAN, THE UNIVERSITY, AND A COMMUNIST LAND	<i>Charles C. West</i> 106
SOUTH-EAST ASIAN SOCIETY AND ITS UNIVERSITY	<i>Mikio Sumiya</i> 114
TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY <i>Paul J. Braisted</i>	119
CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE	<i>A. Roy Eckardt</i> 126
CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CHRISTIAN HOPE	<i>Edgar M. Carlson</i> 137
THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION <i>J. V. Langmead Casserley</i>	142
A COMMENT ON "THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION"	<i>Roger L. Shinn</i> 150
BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS	152
Some Publications on the University Concern	152
<i>Not Minds Alone</i> by Kenneth Irving Brown	<i>Merrimon Cuninggim</i> 152
<i>Higher Education and the Human Spirit</i> by Bernard E. Meland	<i>T. S. K. Scott-Craig</i> 154
<i>The Philosophy of William Dilthey and Languages, Standpoints, and Attitudes</i> by H. A. Hodges	<i>Paul L. Homer</i> 155
<i>A Prisoner for God</i> by Dietrich Bonhoeffer	<i>Charles C. West</i> 157
<i>The Religion of the Hindus</i> by Kenneth W. Morgan ... <i>Virginia Corwin</i> 160	
REPORTS AND NOTICES	162
Reports from Regions on University Concerns	162
Reports on Philosophy-Theology Consultation	<i>Paul L. Homer</i> 167
The National Council on Religion in Higher Education	<i>Elizabeth G. Wright</i> 169
The Visit of Dr. Marjorie Reeves	171

A Note About the Woodcuts

The covers of *The Christian Scholar* are currently presenting another series of woodcuts by the well-known artist, Fritz Kredel. On our March number the subject was St. Francis of Assisi, preaching to his beloved animals.

On the cover of this issue, the watch-tower associated particularly with the prophet, Habakkuk, is depicted. Appropriately for this "international issue," we are invited to stand our watch and hear anew the familiar words of the ancient prophet: "Look among the nations, and see; wonder and be astounded. For I [the Lord] am doing a work in your days that you would not believe if told . . . For the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." (Habakkuk 1:5 and 2:14)

The series of woodcuts prepared by Mr. Kredel for our 1953 volume, the current volume, and another series already tentatively commissioned for 1955, are being made possible by some special gifts for this purpose. It is assumed that, if the entire layout for the cover is retained, the woodcuts will be repeated in three year cycles. Meanwhile, however, plans are also being made for the publication of a distinctive calendar which will present the woodcuts and be especially appropriate for the scholar's desk. This will become available—for 1956—late in 1955. Prices, other details, and the special rates available to subscribers will be announced later.

The series in 1953, to refresh our readers' memories, dealt with the following subjects: 1) March—The Resurrection; 2) June—A Medieval University; 3) September—Luther's Ninety-Five Theses; and 4) December—The Shepherds Receive the Good News.

The Editor's Preface

In the Commission's offices this has been referred to as our "international issue." Other issues have, to be sure, contained something of a world-wide perspective, but this one is set in the global context more fully than any other issue of *The Christian Scholar* published thus far. It initially grew out of a suggestion made last spring by M. M. Thomas, who was then in South India, his home. The suggestion received prompt assent, provided that Mr. Thomas, who has been spending the current academic year in New York in post-graduate studies, would assist in some of the editing tasks. This he agreed to do, and evidences of his insight and experience can be found in many of the following pages. As coordinator of the University Commission of the World's Student Christian Federation, about which more is reported in many portions which follow, his assistance has been invaluable. The fact that he and the Editor were named to serve together as coordinators of the University Commission this year made possible a considerable amount of collaboration on many of the issues which are here reflected.

The additional fact that the World Council of Churches holds its Second Assembly in Evanston, Illinois, during the latter half of August gave further support to the suggestion that this issue be set in a world context. Certainly the concerns of Christians in America will be challenged and stimulated by the fact that this world-wide meeting will be held in our midst. We want to be aware

of the issues with which it will deal; we want to extend cordial welcomes to our fellow-Christians from many lands who will be here; we, too, are in need of being reminded of "the Christian hope" which the Assembly calls to the world's attention in its brokenness and crisis. More specifically, too, our colleges and universities, and their communities of Christian students and teachers, will come to know many Christian colleagues from other lands. Meetings of the World's Student Christian Federation, its University Commission, and a Conference of students and faculty members in conjunction with the Council's Assembly will be direct ways in which international interchange will take place; and, in addition, many of the members of academic communities in other parts of the world will be involved as consultants at the Assembly. This is a year of opportunity and challenge both for our churches and our campuses.

It is to certain aspects of this opportunity that this number is dedicated. Quite obviously, a journal of about eighty pages cannot cover "the world situation" in relation to higher education. Selectivity must be employed; some is inevitably enforced by circumstances themselves. However, in relation to the American scene, the materials presented in this number bear careful reading. Our concern for a re-study of the nature and purpose of higher education, especially since the end of World War II, the attempts we have made to think through the implications of Christian faith for the academic voca-

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

tions, and the growth of "faculty concern" for the responsibilities of teachers in relation to issues of faith—all of these have not sprung from our own soil alone. We have profited by the pioneering work done in Great Britain—the Dons' Movement, Sir Walter Moberly's *The Crisis in the University*, the S.C.M. University Pamphlets, and so on. Moreover, the various crises in higher education on the continent of Europe, where dictatorships challenged anew the claims of reason and recurrent forms of vitalistic irrationalism imperilled empirical methods themselves, have left their imprint upon us. Many hope that America, with its vast educational enterprise based on the ideal of "universal" higher learning, may have learned from the experience of our colleagues abroad.

More recently has come the impact of the university concerns in Asia. In the midst of this complex and socially revolutionary culture, somewhat un-

usual and new claims are being made for the liberating effects of rationalism and secularism of the academic communities. An almost refreshing note is sounded in the midst of those who were prone to find in rampant rationalism and utter secularization the joint scapegoats for all that was evidenced by the "crisis", the fragmentation, the superficiality of campus life and thought, and in a direct "return to religion" as the full solution to all this.

These then are the kind of concerns which are reflected in the pages which follow. It is not quite a "report from the nations," but many of the currently significant regions are represented. Not all the major issues are reflected, but several of them are set forth here in ways which are indicative of some of the primary trends. In order to see them in their proper setting, we move on to a brief description of the University Commission.

THE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION

The "Historical Survey" of the University Concern of the World's Student Christian Federation, prepared for the General Committee in 1953, gives primary attention to the idea of a Christian Professors' Movement. This idea, so far as the Federation's minutes go, was first set forth by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, now General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, in his book *None Other Gods*. Dr. A. John Coleman, the first Secretary of the University Commission and author of *The Task of the Christian in the University* (Federation Gray Book,

1946), calls to mind this passage from Dr. Visser 't Hooft's book: "Our task . . . is above all that of working out the implications of the central affirmation (of Christianity) for the various realms of intellectual life. At a time when thought-life is almost completely secularized, even among the large majority of Christians, that calling is of super-human difficulty. But it is just as urgent as the other calling, to carry Christianity into social and international life. In fact, the two are interdependent. Unconverted thought and unconverted action belong together. There is just as much

THE EDITOR'S PREFACE

need of an 'intellectual Gospel' as of a true 'social Gospel.'" The need, which he cited for a Christian Professors' Movement has been explored, amplified, and pursued in many countries since 1944, and more especially since the end of World War II.

In that year, now a decade ago, the Federation expressed the hope that it might aid in building up "a Christian fellowship of university men and women," whose purpose would be (1) to proclaim Christ's lordship over all realms of life; (2) to find the implications of this faith for every branch of study and every profession; (3) to help members of the Student Christian Movements to relate their faith to their calling as students; (4) to cooperate with other bodies in rediscovering the meaning of the university, and its function in society and in the creation of a true *civitas academica*; and (5) to form teams of laymen and theologians who will help the churches and the ecumenical movement to give the Christian answer to the problems of our time. The story continues with many more specific questions being raised, the publication of the Gray Book by Dr. Coleman, and the appearance of Dr. Arnold Nash's *The University and the Modern World*. Concern over the relation between scientific rationalism and Christian faith, the living of the Christian life in the setting of the modern university, and the creation of what Coleman called the "Integral University" and what in Asia is called the "Responsible University" became concerns of first importance. Increasingly the primary question was,

not how can the Christian community best serve to gain its ends in the academic community, but how may it best serve to aid "the university to fulfill its true purpose."

These became the issues in relation to which the Federation established its continuing Commission on the task of the Christian in the university. It would function, according to the early decisions, by means of regional meetings, occasional world conferences, and by correspondence. Among its tasks would be the elucidation of the presuppositions which underlie different intellectual disciplines and the relation of Christianity to them, the initiating of a Christian professors' movement, and consideration of the ways whereby Christians and non-Christians might best cooperate at points of their common concerns in the university. While not all of these tasks have been pursued with equal vigor, at each point where national and regional developments were taking place along these and related lines the Federation's officers and staff had a deep interest and a sense of shared responsibilities.

After 1949 certain new advances began to appear. Increasingly, the University Commission's attention was called to the need for community, responsible thought, and academic freedom in the colleges and universities. The phrase, "the university question," began to make its appearance, as the attempt among Christians to gain an understanding of God's purposes for the university and the Christian community within it. The meaning of evangelism in the academic world was brought under increasing

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

scrutiny and repeatedly it was asserted that this involves a form of Christian thinking, a dialectic between Christian faith and the academic disciplines, which is an integral part of the Christian life. Increasingly, too, during recent years, the decentralization of the University Commission made it possible for various regional efforts to be strengthened, to pursue their own courses in relation to their academic and cultural situations, and to encourage markedly the concerns of the total Christian community in the academic world as united concerns.

During the past several years various initiatives in the United States have brought into formation the Faculty Christian Fellowship; it is at least the embryo of a movement of college and university teachers who seek to view their vocation as Christians, to gain a deeper understanding of the relation between their disciplines and Christianity, and to reinstate conversation and community on basic issues in the college or university and in its relation to society. In Europe there has been, on the one hand, the work of the Dons' Advisory Group in Britain, which has held several conferences and continued to explore the university question, and, on the other hand, the work of the Studien Gemeinschaft der Evangelischen Akademien and various conferences designed to study the place of the Christian scholar in the modern university. In Asia there was the Conference in Bandung, Indonesia, in 1952, a report of which is to be found in the article by Paul J. Braisted and also in the volume, edited by M. M. Thomas,

entitled *The Idea of a Responsible University in Asia Today*. Many other reports of specific activities are noted in the Report Section of this issue. From August 10-15, the University Commission will meet in Monmouth, Illinois, to discuss the future of its task and to consider such questions as "The University, Culture, and Human Community," and "What are the Prospects for a World-Wide Professors' Movement?"

In its relation to teachers, the University Commission seeks to cooperate in the revitalization of university life, to contribute insights from Christian faith to the understanding of the intellectual vocation, and to be the mediator between the Church, the University, and society. It focuses attention, as Mr. Thomas says, upon "Christian vocation, not after or in addition to study, but in it; it would speak of study and research not as purely intellectual activities, but as the total activity of persons in conversation with one another in the true community under God." If the Christian Gospel is also intellectual, then there is still much to be discovered of the challenging relevance of its claims to the academic work of teachers and students. It can speak a word of judgment and illumination in the rational pursuit of Truth; it can call for decision and commitment, a service which is "perfect freedom"; and it can stand in a needful relation to healthy academic life. But, the Christian too needs to think as a Christian, to make his affirmation in his status of rational life, and to define this status in terms

THE EDITOR'S PREFACE

which confront either the idolatry of rationalism or the reaction of irrationalism, both of which would destroy the rational character of the university. Thus, the Christian and the Christian community need to take intellectual and cultural issues seriously, and to keep alive, when it is imperilled, the rational ferment essential to the healthy academic community.

This is the dialectical, the "Socratic", task. It is not an easy task. It participates in the perplexities of the intellectual world today; it reminds the Christian that he has no neat and final answers to the whole gamut of intellectual questions; and, in his encounter with those who vigorously hold other faiths, the Christian can learn something of the meaning of his own faith for his intellectual vocation. The Christian who has grappled with these issues should keep integrity in his own convictions, and credit the same to others, so that

the examination of faiths may be fully relevant. As stated in the minutes of the Federation's General Committee held last year in Nasrapur, India, leadership is frequently forthcoming among "Christians who are within the Christian fellowship but maintain a continuous conversation with the world outside. There is a great deal of 'religion' that may need to be destroyed both among Christians and non-Christians, because it may be no more than gods created by man. At this point the secular faiths may serve to challenge the Christians to true faith."

This is the venture into which the Christian in the university is called. But, it is a venture within the life of the historic community of faith, the Church. In the end, it has its support in the Christian hope, which is, in turn, undergirded by the faithfulness of God—that faithfulness by which "man" is justified.

The Christian Task in the University

A. JOHN COLEMAN



EN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS who participated in a Federation conference in 1947 summed up their conclusions in three points: 1) "We consider that the implications of the Christian faith in the various spheres of knowledge have not been taken seriously with the result that our teaching and scholarship are divorced from our religious life and beliefs." 2) "The university is no longer seen as a community with a purpose which teachers and students jointly seek to realize." 3) "The university . . . too often reflects the weaknesses and corruptions of society."

These three points show quite vividly the desperate situation in which the Christian professor and student is today. Probably that situation is no worse than it has ever been, but that is a very slight consolation for anyone who really tries to feel his way into the actual spiritual state of the university today. It is generally admitted that a spirit suggested, but not precisely defined, by the term "scientific humanism", has overwhelmingly predominated in the Western university in recent times. There are local deviations arising from various forms of nationalism, incursions of Marxian idealism or a militant Hinduism. However, no matter what name you give it and no matter what local nuances it may have, this spirit of the university is a very powerful reality and the average Christian in the university is like a poor fish swimming by himself in an enormous ocean! Since the Christians have largely surrendered to bourgeois individualism they are devoid of the strength and insight which should properly be theirs as members of "the communion of saints."

Christian thinking does not mean thinking within the confines of a precisely formulated dogmatic framework. It does mean *common* thinking and sharing of problems and insights within the communion of saints. It means *concrete* thinking which is related to man and his need of salvation at every level of his life. What *Christian thinking* truly is probably defies exact definition. But it is certain that it is a demanding process, which requires discipline, unselfishness, commitment and working together with other Christians. It means thinking and living whose richness we only begin dimly to envisage.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITY

Because her members are unable to discern the spirits we frequently forget that secularism penetrates the very bosom of the Church. The uncritical nationalism of many churches, their dependence on the dominant political authority, and their buttressing of the prevailing economic order have been and are too patent to re-

Dr. A. John Coleman, the first Federation staff member responsible primarily for its University concern, and author of the Gray Book, *The Task of the Christian in the University*, teaches mathematics at the University of Toronto in Canada. This article is a revised and condensed statement, first presented in *The Student World*, Second number, 1949.

THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN THE UNIVERSITY

quire elaboration here. But there are other less obvious evils which come from our failure to think as Christians.

The most fundamental is a misunderstanding of the nature of the Church's message and the role of the layman in announcing that message. The Gospel is not verbal. It is an act. It is the fact that mankind is saved in Jesus Christ, and not mankind merely as a sum of individuals but man and men *in toto* as individuals, as communities, and as dwellers in the universe. This, surely, is part of the meaning of St. Paul's rich doctrine of Christ in Colossians. Christ is "prior to all and all coheres in Him." Just as the Gospel is not verbal, so its announcement is not primarily by "preaching." Preaching has an extremely important function to perform, but the primary announcement of the Gospel is by the appearance of "new men in Christ Jesus." The "new man" is really something new and different in every aspect of his being; his emotions, his words, his action, his thinking, his communal activities. Since the life of the university graduate largely consists in the exercise of certain intellectual skills and disciplines which he developed in the university, his "newness" must be manifest in the exercise of these skills and disciplines. The new discovery of the task of the layman is the most important "growing-point" for our understanding of the nature and function of the Church.

A second consequence has been the puerile reaction of the Church to science, a question which has been discussed again and again in recent years. In the nineteenth century the Church was largely fighting a rearguard action against a self-confident science, and constantly having to admit defeat, because she had unconsciously confused the eternal message of which she is the custodian with classic or feudal physical, psychological, and philosophical theories. This was followed by the disgraceful period when theology waited wistfully at the table of the reigning Queen hoping to be vouchsafed a few crumbs of scientific evidence to buttress the faith. In the third phase, now that the atomic bomb has somewhat shaken men's confidence in the benevolence of their monarch, there is not lacking a supply of theologians who gloat over the possibility that men will be driven to the Church through fear. It seems incredible—to be happy because it is now patently clear that man is so powerful and so sinful that he can destroy himself. Of course there have been many theologians in all these periods who have avoided such gross errors but the above gives a faithful indication of the attitudes the average man of science has usually found in the church. One of the most encouraging developments of the past few years has been the appearance of a theology which has neither an arrogant nor a servile attitude to science. Even so the basic problem has not yet been tackled: the creation of a community of scientists and theologians which could be the bearer of concrete insights and suggestions of the sort which would be of positive value in helping the scientists come to a Christian decision on the variety of problems which continually occur. These decisions in fact constitute the effect of science on the world and on mankind.

The Christian Task in the University

A. JOHN COLEMAN



EN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS who participated in a Federation conference in 1947 summed up their conclusions in three points: 1) "We consider that the implications of the Christian faith in the various spheres of knowledge have not been taken seriously with the result that our teaching and scholarship are divorced from our religious life and beliefs." 2) "The university is no longer seen as a community with a purpose which teachers and students jointly seek to realize." 3) "The university . . . too often reflects the weaknesses and corruptions of society."

These three points show quite vividly the desperate situation in which the Christian professor and student is today. Probably that situation is no worse than it has ever been, but that is a very slight consolation for anyone who really tries to feel his way into the actual spiritual state of the university today. It is generally admitted that a spirit suggested, but not precisely defined, by the term "scientific humanism", has overwhelmingly predominated in the Western university in recent times. There are local deviations arising from various forms of nationalism, incursions of Marxian idealism or a militant Hinduism. However, no matter what name you give it and no matter what local nuances it may have, this spirit of the university is a very powerful reality and the average Christian in the university is like a poor fish swimming by himself in an enormous ocean! Since the Christians have largely surrendered to bourgeois individualism they are devoid of the strength and insight which should properly be theirs as members of "the communion of saints."

Christian thinking does not mean thinking within the confines of a precisely formulated dogmatic framework. It does mean *common* thinking and sharing of problems and insights within the communion of saints. It means *concrete* thinking which is related to man and his need of salvation at every level of his life. What *Christian thinking* truly is probably defies exact definition. But it is certain that it is a demanding process, which requires discipline, unselfishness, commitment and working together with other Christians. It means thinking and living whose richness we only begin dimly to envisage.

THE CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITY

Because her members are unable to discern the spirits we frequently forget that secularism penetrates the very bosom of the Church. The uncritical nationalism of many churches, their dependence on the dominant political authority, and their buttressing of the prevailing economic order have been and are too patent to re-

Dr. A. John Coleman, the first Federation staff member responsible primarily for its University concern, and author of the Gray Book, *The Task of the Christian in the University*, teaches mathematics at the University of Toronto in Canada. This article is a revised and condensed statement, first presented in *The Student World*, Second number, 1949.

THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN THE UNIVERSITY

quire elaboration here. But there are other less obvious evils which come from our failure to think as Christians.

The most fundamental is a misunderstanding of the nature of the Church's message and the role of the layman in announcing that message. The Gospel is not verbal. It is an act. It is the fact that mankind is saved in Jesus Christ, and not mankind merely as a sum of individuals but man and men *in toto* as individuals, as communities, and as dwellers in the universe. This, surely, is part of the meaning of St. Paul's rich doctrine of Christ in Colossians. Christ is "prior to all and all coheres in Him." Just as the Gospel is not verbal, so its announcement is not primarily by "preaching." Preaching has an extremely important function to perform, but the primary announcement of the Gospel is by the appearance of "new men in Christ Jesus." The "new man" is really something new and different in every aspect of his being; his emotions, his words, his action, his thinking, his communal activities. Since the life of the university graduate largely consists in the exercise of certain intellectual skills and disciplines which he developed in the university, his "newness" must be manifest in the exercise of these skills and disciplines. The new discovery of the task of the layman is the most important "growing-point" for our understanding of the nature and function of the Church.

A second consequence has been the puerile reaction of the Church to science, a question which has been discussed again and again in recent years. In the nineteenth century the Church was largely fighting a rearguard action against a self-confident science, and constantly having to admit defeat, because she had unconsciously confused the eternal message of which she is the custodian with classic or feudal physical, psychological, and philosophical theories. This was followed by the disgraceful period when theology waited wistfully at the table of the reigning Queen hoping to be vouchsafed a few crumbs of scientific evidence to buttress the faith. In the third phase, now that the atomic bomb has somewhat shaken men's confidence in the benevolence of their monarch, there is not lacking a supply of theologians who gloat over the possibility that men will be driven to the Church through fear. It seems incredible—to be happy because it is now patently clear that man is so powerful and so sinful that he can destroy himself. Of course there have been many theologians in all these periods who have avoided such gross errors but the above gives a faithful indication of the attitudes the average man of science has usually found in the church. One of the most encouraging developments of the past few years has been the appearance of a theology which has neither an arrogant nor a servile attitude to science. Even so the basic problem has not yet been tackled: the creation of a community of scientists and theologians which could be the bearer of concrete insights and suggestions of the sort which would be of positive value in helping the scientists come to a Christian decision on the variety of problems which continually occur. These decisions in fact constitute the effect of science on the world and on mankind.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

Both of the points above are related to the task of the theologians. On this question Daniel Jenkins stated at the first University Conference of the World's Student Christian Federation: "I am fully persuaded that theology stands to benefit from our renewed concern about the university as much as other subjects. Theologians need a totally new conception of their role in the university. Rather than sitting in our studies trying to formulate new scholasticisms, we theologians should stand beside the doctor, the lawyer and the scientist in constant sympathetic converse with him, trying to view his problems from inside his situation, adding a voice with our own specialist knowledge to the voices which are prompting him, so that he can more surely come to a responsible decision. The theologian's task is not to achieve some nice, quiet, scientific description. It is to engage in a battle for the world. And unless we come to grips with the real world we betray our *raison d'être*."*

If the theologians are to come to grips with the real world they will need the assistance of laymen, but if this is to be effective we need more laymen who are theologically alert than exist today.

THE CHRISTIAN'S TASK IN THE UNIVERSITY

If members of the Church are to learn to think as Christians, the process must begin in the university. We must do at least the following five things: 1) We must become a university Christian movement, that is a body of students and professors who together seek to live out the implications of their Christian faith in the university. 2) We must discover a new type of Christian professor. His newness would consist chiefly in his taking seriously the sort of questions we have already raised in this article. Then, Christian professors must become aware of one another and become more explicit as to the meaning of their vocation as Christian professors. 3) In the midst of all the discussion in university circles about integration we must learn to express the fact that in the last analysis it is in Christ alone that integration is given to us. Integration is finally to be achieved not by any compost of all knowledge (General Education), nor by embracing an ideology even the ideology of democracy, nor by intellectual assent to a philosophy even as comprehensive as Thomism. Integration can only result from an act of will, from pursuit of an all-embracing purpose—ultimately, only from submission *in a community* to Jesus Christ in whom all coheres. If the Christian is clear about this he may find significant value in some of the schemes for "integration", and he will certainly have a point of reference to help him discern what is good in them. A basis of integration for so social an institution as a university must contain as its chief ingredient a definition of social purpose, yet in the confused condition of our Western culture it is precisely impossible to find a commanding incarnation of social purpose. We should note that a university cannot exist in the *idea* of such

* *The Student World*, Fourth Quarter, 1947, p. 311.

THE CHRISTIAN TASK IN THE UNIVERSITY

a purpose but only in a *society* dominated by it. In the Middle Ages the community of the universal Church provided such a social framework. More recently universities have been integrated on the basis of nationalism mitigated slightly by the universalism of science. The renowned Harvard Report based on the American way of life is an instance of this. The Ecumenical Church, if it became a much more vivid reality, could provide the social basis for a dynamic integrating sense of purpose in the university.

4) We must prosecute the discussion of the implications of Christianity for the different fields of knowledge. We have raised above the question of the relation of Christianity to science. It seems clear that what is needed is studies by individuals and groups of specific disciplines. 5) The commitment of our mind and studies to God and the petition that He will redeem all scholarship and make his Lordship manifest in the universities of the world must be the constant elements in our prayers. Our prayers need to be more real and vivid.

God is able to work out his purpose among the strong and wise. Where He will lead us no one can discern. No one foresaw the World Council of Churches when folk in the early days of the Federation began to assert their conviction that the disunity of the Church was a sin. Nor could anyone have foreseen the decisive way in which God used the Federation in the creation of the Council. In an analogous way we may expect that God may again use the Federation, if we are faithful, in recalling all scholarship to its Lord for the enrichment and purification of the Church and for the salvation of the world.

Is The University Question Dead?

RONALD H. PRESTON



THE AWARENESS OF WHAT WE CALL "the University question," as one involving issues of vital importance to Christians, seems first to have arisen in the British Student Christian Movement in the early 1930's. It slowly gathered momentum during that decade, and then, after a brief period of suspension in the dislocations caused by the outbreak of war, broke out with renewed vitality following the publication of Arnold Nash's *The University and the Modern World* in 1944. It is not necessary for our present purposes to pursue its history further, except to point out that by the late 1940's it was being taken up in U. S. A. and other Anglo-Saxon countries. The vitality of the discussion in U. S. A. (witness the admirable enterprise of *The Christian Scholar* itself) seems greater now than in Britain. The same may perhaps be said of Asia where, chiefly through the University Commission of the World's Student Christian Federation, lively developments appear to be taking place. However, it is true that in Britain the question of the present dilemmas and future possibilities of the University in its total cultural setting has been subject to a Christian diagnosis and discussion which has been kept vital for a decade. This is a sufficiently long period for us to wonder whether the subject is now exhausted and whether the whole University question is now a dead one.

There are three reasons arising in Britain itself and one from the Continent which make it necessary to face the issue. (1) There is the general nature of the S. C. M. It is a continually changing body at the student level, and its staff, as a matter of deliberate policy, also changes frequently. Even its leaders do not last a decade. On the one hand, the S. C. M. has by this means kept very much in touch with the pulse of events, and has certainly been the most responsive and farseeing body in the whole of British Christianity throughout this century. On the other hand, there is a tendency in the student world for interest in different aspects of Christianity to go in cycles. There is, for instance, far less interest in Christian political and civic responsibility now in the British S. C. M. than there was immediately after war. Similarly, there is much less interest in "the University question." Does this mean that the University question is not, as those who brought it to the fore thought it was, one of quite basic importance to the very existence of the S. C. M. as a movement of *Christian students* and therefore one which should condition its entire life of thought and prayer? Does it rather mean that the University question is one among many facets of the Christian life which we may expect to come to the fore periodically (perhaps every twenty years), but not one which need be of continuous concern?

(2) Allied to this, there is a feeling at the student level that the whole question is too abstruse for the ordinary student. It expects of him a mental and spirit-

Ronald H. Preston is warden of St. Anselm Hall and Lecturer in Christian Ethics at the University of Manchester.

IS THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION DEAD?

ual sophistication and an ability to think independently and to transcend the University structure in which he lives which is possible only to the very best student, and then only to the type of mind which has a philosophical bent and a flair for abstract thought. Therefore, it is felt an issue on this level of difficulty cannot be the foundation of the work of any Christian body, for if it is, we shall be led to suppose that the Kingdom of God is only for certain types of "first."

(3) Christian faculty members have now had two conferences at Swanwick in Derbyshire, and many local groups have met for discussions on Sir Walter Moberly's now famous book, *The Crisis in the University*. What next? Many of them never felt happy with the phrase that occurs in the book suggesting that they should be a "creative minority" in the University. It savoured of presumption, they thought, and in any case they did not feel like a creative minority. In many ways University staff are both individualistic and timid; they do not like being organized and they do not like making a stand. Many of them felt that the term "crisis" in the title of Sir Walter Moberly's book savoured slightly of hysteria, and some suspected that the S. C. M. had a vested interest in talking about a crisis as a useful propaganda weapon, and half suspected it of having invented one. In any event, even if Moberly's book has been digested in a staff group and its contentions broadly accepted, one cannot go on discussing it forever. So what next? Does the necessary sequel amount to much more than saying that we Christians ought to do better and more conscientiously what we are already trying to do, including co-operation with all men of goodwill in the University for humane ends?

(4) Doubts of another kind are sometimes heard from some continental members of the W. S. C. F. who are particularly influenced by Karl Barth in theology, but who have not necessarily kept up with the latest phase of that quixotic and contra-suggestible theologian. It is said that the whole University question is an Anglo-Saxon quirk, a typical example of culture-Christianity which mixes up the radical Christo-centricity of the Gospel with the values of western civilization. In any case, talk of an 'integral' or a 'responsible' university is irrelevant everywhere else in the world except in the Anglo-Saxon countries, in none of which has the social fabric as yet suffered the strain of invasion or occupation. Its danger, however, is more serious than its irrelevance, for it is an example of "natural theology" creeping insidiously into Christian thought, to the confusion of the Gospel. This Gospel has nothing directly to say about the structures of social and political life, and hence about the University. Christians are told to love their neighbors as themselves in every circumstance of life. That is all and that is enough. Each must work it out for himself in the spiritual freedom of the justified man.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SECULAR "ORDERS"

This last point takes us, of course, beyond the University question to that of the possibility of a theology of the secular, of social structures, of the "orders" of life, or whatever term is used to designate the everyday world of institutions

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

in which we all have to live. To go into it fully would take us far beyond the scope of this present article. Suffice it to say that there are many lines of argument which show such a theology to be not only possible but necessary, and the denial of it an eccentricity. We refer to just one of them. This stresses that God has created certain structures of life into which men are born willy-nilly, structures which profoundly mould them from birth, and long before they are able to take any personal initiative in relation to them. These structures start with the family and go on to include the economic, political and cultural realms. It is thus of profound importance that the way these structures work should not only negatively restrain the anarchistic passions of men (which might otherwise reduce life to chaos), but also positively create the most just and humane framework within which men made in God's image may develop. That is why it is the inescapable responsibility of the Christian to play his part in these structures so as to help to mould them, not for directly evangelistic purposes, but to fulfil God's will for the structures themselves. Applying this to the University, we can easily see that in the present state of all these structures there is a God-given role for the University. It includes the advancement of knowledge and the training within a community of learning of the skilled personnel necessary for modern society. To justify this in detail is not necessary for our present purposes, as the case will be familiar to readers of this journal.

If the University has its place in a theology of the created order, then it is entirely right, proper and indeed our bounden duty to inquire what are the necessary assumptions and commitments that the University must make if it is to be true to itself, and how far these are acknowledged and implemented in practice. It was to the first of these points that Professor Dorothy Emmet addressed herself so effectively in her University pamphlet. These assumptions and commitments do not go so far as to require the University officially to accept Christianity, even though we may well think that Christianity provides much the strongest grounds for acknowledging them. Nevertheless in so far as men may hold them on other grounds, Christians must gladly work with them for the well-being of mankind. To do so is not to betray the Gospel but to act on a proper theology of the secular, of society, of culture; the same argument applies to other structures of life. We may be confident, then, that on general theological grounds the University question is not dead but is to be taken very seriously.

THE TASK OF CHRISTIAN STUDENTS

When we turn to what we should expect of undergraduates, it is true that they cannot do a great deal on a large scale to correct what is amiss in the modern University. Nevertheless it is of the greatest importance that Christian students should be helped to some understanding of these issues in order to be able to live as responsible human beings. Responsible, worshipful obedience to the God and

IS THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION DEAD?

Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is the hallmark of Christian living. A Christian student must believe that it is God's will that he should be at the University and that the University itself has a God-given function or he should never have come up in the first place. At it he will find a chaos of conflicting views, and an absence of that community life in which the conflict might be creative. For however much we talk of the University being not so much a set of buildings as an academic community, more often than not it does not work out like that. The average undergraduate finds it difficult to know faculty members or even other students outside his own set in his own year. It is only too easy for him to allow himself to go through a process at the University without ever taking a proper, human, personal attitude either to the basic issues of life or to the enterprise of study on which he is engaged. It is easy for him to assume that if he is not being lectured to or examined, there is nothing to do at the University.

Christian students need help in seeing how their intellectual work may be carried out in a way which will glorify God and not be tedious and shoddy; and this is help which is required for each new student generation. It includes thinking out the role of the University student in the Church and in the world. It involves learning how to bring the life of the mind before God in prayer. It means an openness to new truth and a readiness to shed what is shown to be inadequate in the religious faith they brought with them to College. All this requires a Christian community in the student world where these truths can be learned together, these problems faced, and this worship offered. The S. C. M. in Great Britain and similar movements in U. S. A. are trying to be just such a community. Merely to describe its aims is to see at once that so far from being something appropriate only to the exceptionally clever student, the University question concerns every Christian student. The very clever will penetrate further into the issues involved, but some understanding of what it means to be a *Christian student*—both words being equally important—is necessary for all. It is a necessity on simple pastoral grounds. Without it one cannot live a truly human, responsible life at the University.

THE TASK IN RELATION TO TEACHING

One function of student Christian bodies like the S.C.M. is to produce a number of members who go on to University teaching and research. Whilst in one way the faculty member who is a Christian faces the same problems as the undergraduate, in another sense his situation is different. He is not a bird of passage but may be there for a lifetime. Once he has considered the basic issues as presented, for instance, by Moberly, he does not want to continue going over the same general ground. 'What next?' becomes an urgent question. If he is a keen Christian he will probably be very conscientious in his normal work with his colleagues and students, and also be taking at least his fair share and probably more in the general life of the University and the various administrative and social tasks that that involves.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

Time will therefore press heavily on him. Nevertheless I am convinced that University teachers do need a fellowship of thought and prayer which addresses itself to the peculiar joys and responsibilities of the Christian intellectual. Those who are regular churchgoers cannot find all they need in parish life, which must function in a more general way. It is certainly very important that they should be churchgoers and throw in their lot with a congregation, but what parish life can offer them, vital as it is, needs supplementing.

There are also many faculty members who are broadly Christian, but because of various intellectual scruples and lack of churchgoing friends, they have no link with any Christian congregation and would be helped enormously by such a Christian fellowship at the University. One of the main difficulties of the whole situation is that of bringing such fellowships into being, partly owing to the shyness of University teachers, partly owing to the lack of those adequately qualified to minister to them. After all, it requires considerable pastoral gifts and great intellectual acumen to be able to enter into so many "frontier" situations, where the everlasting gospel has to relate itself to the ever-changing intellectual map. But without such fellowship Christians in the same University will go on in the ridiculous situation of not knowing one another, not helping one another, and not praying with one another; and, the regular churchgoers among them will largely remain in a state of intellectual schizophrenia whereby their basic faith is unconnected with their professional studies. For these reasons we do need something like a University Christian Movement—(such as the Faculty Christian Fellowship in U. S. A.) and the University question cannot be said to be dead while these needs are not met. And insofar as Christian faculty members are not alive to these needs, it is necessary to try and help them to become aware of them.

There is, lastly, the ongoing intellectual task of clarifying the presuppositions of one's own field of study and relating them to those of others and to those of the Christian faith. Moberly's book said curiously little about this, but a good beginning of systematic exploration of these issues has been made in the Hazen Foundation pamphlets in U. S. A. on "The Religious Perspectives of College Teaching." Here are issues which are almost inexhaustible, and which need to be worked at in small groups within different disciplines and across them, and within one country and internationally. One good example was the recent conference in Britain of theologians, philosophers and teachers of English literature on 'Imagery.'

Christians by being true to these various tasks which their faith lays upon them will, in doing so, contribute to the renewal of the University, both in its intellectual foundations and in humanizing the way it works with respect to its effects on people. Certainly there are no quick solutions; if anyone thinks there are, or still more that we have found them and can now put the University question aside, he must be simple minded. The University question is not dead: it is only in its infancy.

General Studies In Germany Today

By W. PHILIPP



FTER WORLD WAR II many university professors in Germany, who had belonged to the opposition during the Nazi regime as well as those in exile, felt that thorough discussions would have to precede the re-opening of German universities in order to discover a pattern which would do justice to the challenge of the times. The Western powers permitted studies in their occupation zones surprisingly soon, apparently influenced by the fact that the Russian authorities had decreed shortly after the war that the work of the universities be resumed in their zone. The extraordinary onrush of students justified this measure, but at the same time made necessary the retention of traditional patterns of the university.

However, there had been a lively discussion of a university reform around 1930, which had been abruptly halted by the Nazi regime. The danger of the university devoting itself to merely specialized training and becoming educationally ineffective, which had already been apparent at that time, was further realized and deepened under the Nazi regime. The development toward intellectual independence disappeared, even though technical education, the quality of which was greatly reduced, remained. Just as after 1918 the students had taken full part in the rich, diversified intellectual life in Germany and had lived in the common hope for a new formation of society and worked intensively, both theoretically and practically, for its realization, so also they shared in the general paralysis and futility prevalent in 1945. In contrast to 1914, students had been drawn into the war this time; they had no desire for a wholesome change of reality and no spiritual foundation or intellectual categories which might have made it possible for them at least to classify and digest the horrible war experiences. The war could not release resources which could have pointed the way toward the future; intellectual independence and its prestige had been destroyed by the National Socialists; the middle class and proletarian idealism had disintegrated; and the work of religion and the church was hampered and defamed. Their zealously nurtured faith in their own strength and in their own racial superiority had finally proved itself a false value and without support at the time of the regime's collapse. The fragmentary beginnings of a new intellectual orientation and the secret adherence to the old values were possible only to a few young people during the Nazi regime, not to speak of the actual formation of groups opposing the regime. In addition to that came an extraordinary deterioration of education through a frightening lowering of standards and through the influence of war.

The German universities endeavored therefore, when they were re-opened, to solve two problems: to impart to the students the lacking fundamental knowledge

Dr. Werner Philipp is Professor of East-European History at the Free University in Berlin. The manuscript was secured by Pastor Peter Kreyssig and translated by Mrs. Dzidra B. Anderson.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

of a general kind, and at the same time give them an insight into the premises and relationships of the sciences among themselves and to society. These endeavors, which in view of the political developments generally corresponded to the re-education efforts made by the Western powers, were gradually summarized under the name of "general studies". The motive was to restore the lost "universitas litterarum" and to again incorporate the university into the political life—qualities which had become characteristic of the modern German university through the work of Humboldt because of program considerations and political circumstances and which since the middle of the 19th century had been lost. Highly diversified ways were tried by individual universities: additional semesters were inserted before the regular course of study, attendance of which was either compulsory or optional; the completion of this additional course was either certified or a final examination was required at the end of the semester. Participation in these courses was either advised or required for the period of the whole curriculum which served these purposes. Lectures and discussion groups were held dealing with questions of politics or art, and inter-departmental seminars and interdenominational conversations were conducted, often under the auspices of student groups.

It is quite certain that these efforts provided the basis for meaningful studies for a large number of postwar students, but also from the very beginning there appeared a widespread passive resistance within the student body itself against these general studies, and since early 1953 the general studies have moved more and more into the background of German university life. There are various reasons for this. Through the war and imprisonment the students had prematurely aged, and they pressed toward the quickest possible completion of their studies in order to enter upon a profession. They, therefore, limited themselves to specialized training, that is, aimed only to quickly close the gaps in their knowledge. Unfortunately the war generation has passed on this limiting of studies to examination requirements to the later student generations. In addition, improvement of the school system gradually made unnecessary the need to catch up on basic education in the universities and furnished the young people with a certain general education before entering the university. A great number of university professors, moreover, simply carried on a purely professional instruction and refused to undertake a genuine work of education. The group of younger university professors which shouldered it had taken over an extraordinary additional load of work in a situation where they themselves were either just beginning their teaching activities, or resuming them often after a long interruption. They had to turn to this after a few years of intensive research work, even though the general studies had not become a matter of course in German universities.

However, there are still other reasons to be taken into consideration not stemming directly from the postwar situation. Despite all the discussions of the twenties, which had been somewhat related to Max Weber's concept of science, the

GENERAL STUDIES IN GERMANY TODAY

idea of a science, which does not question the student himself, is still normative with the students. It is certainly not exaggerated to maintain that there is often present today an escape into specialized work. One must note the enormous achievement on the part of the German students, which in view of all the economic difficulties during these last years demands the greatest respect. One would accord this respect much more easily and freely if at the same time this achievement meant an effort toward the education of the individual. In most cases, however, education means only the acquisition of knowledge without transforming it into ideas; it means a discussion of scientific possibilities without feeling the necessity of forming an attitude of evaluation. If the past is being studied without relating it to the present, or only in order to discover the causal relationships of facts, if theology is studied without taking into account the insecurity of modern man, how much less can it be expected that the attitude of man toward the abstract and physical world will be drawn into the studies of such fields as mathematics and natural science and into the discussions about the "true" and "false" of a solution in these fields. It seems that one prefers the study and construction of self-contained theories of a given profession, since by so doing he need not bring himself into question. One does not want to be disturbed. There are parallels to this. Even though there are doubtless encouraging beginnings of a new community life within the German student body, it is equally frightening that considerable numbers have taken over the community life of the fraternity, which Virchow in 1918 had already described as being out of date. The material advantages which the fraternities offer their members, can become especially tempting if one lacks the courage to get along without the security of established groups. Here is to be found the same need for security, the same disregard of a critical consideration of one's own situation. Specialized studies and social behavior are not regarded from the point of view of what is necessary for our time. While behaving in this way, one can, of course, be scientifically and socially active, but one's peace of mind is purchased with a basically fruitless activity. Here is perhaps the strongest element which resists the broadening and deepening of university education, as the general studies strive to do. In addition, it can now be clearly seen that the war generation of students, who actually had much more right to limit themselves to specialized studies, have doubtless inquired more intensely into the meaning and premises of specialized or professional studies, and have tried more experimental ways of living together than the students who are at present in institutions of higher learning.

Still another paradoxical factor unfavorable to the general studies is inherent in the studies themselves. While their aim is to help overcome the fragmentation in university education in favor of a genuine education, the general studies themselves joined the specialized studies as another system. They became another specialized study, which becomes especially clear when general studies are placed before the "real" curriculum as a complete and required course. The students plod through

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

these courses, regarding them as a necessary evil, and rarely see them in any vital relationship to their professional training. Only in the rarest cases will it have meaning to hold lectures on theology, philosophy, political science and so forth, in which the "surveys", "introductions" and "universally-intelligible" aspects of the disciplines in question are unfolded. These additional activities have been rightly regarded by students as an additional load, or simply as a preparation for their professional education. By affirming the high specialization which modern science demands, and which cannot be abandoned by going back to the pre-positivistic, speculative approaches of romanticism, the subjects must be exposed so thoroughly that their religious, philosophical, social and political inner relationships and meanings become clear. In the narrow pit of professional work one should break through to the deeper layer of questions of meaning and relationships. From this would result a direct contact with the disciplines and with one's own situation in life. We should stop complaining about the specialization so necessary to our modern life, but rather carry it through as thoroughly as possible. Professional education would then become more meaningful to the student and would develop him in his disturbance and relate him to other disciplines and to people. General studies would then become superfluous. How to make this possible in the professional fields is perhaps the most pressing question for professors, but this question must also be regarded as such by the students.

The question of general studies has turned into a search after much deeper relationships than simply how to overcome a war conditioned emergency. The educational paralysis of the modern descriptive and experimental sciences has become sharply clear; it confronts an insurmountable wealth of material and also an independent, relationless political sphere. This problem has arisen in a similar way out of different historical circumstances. The author was permitted a glimpse into the serious efforts of the English Dons' Advisory Group, which is discussing the problem of university education out of a sense of religious responsibility. The impossibility of perpetuating the educational ideal of Oxford and Cambridge was expressed by one of the participants in the following appropriate formulation: "Where has the time gone when we developed character in leisure and play?" Obviously England has reached the same dilemma, while having developed a type of university which has emphasized more exclusively character formation, without perceiving the traditional "pure" scientific activity of the German university as a possible solution. The situation for Germany is further complicated by the fact that for some German students the Soviet Russian "solution" of the difficulty has become compulsory; professional education with the narrowest kind of specialization, and simultaneously binding the students objectively and subjectively to a doctrine which must be learned and swallowed, whereby the fixed interpretation of the Party in specialized research without critical examination can be traced. In this case the difficulty is covered up by a "Trojan horse" ideology, and it is

GENERAL STUDIES IN GERMANY TODAY

not solved.

It does not help us to seek refuge either in some alien doctrine, or in an imposed general education. We stand only at the beginning of the effort to put the professional curriculum into a meaningful, educational relationship to man. The attempts of the general studies have helped to sharpen the sight of students and teachers toward this end. It is a good sign that out of the general studies have developed the "tutor groups", that is, the efforts in small groups to discuss the meaning of professional work with the help of introductory courses. In this way it will be possible to engender a genuine vocationally based interest, probably the only fruitful basis for a genuine work of education in our time.

In the postwar years the Christian student groups have assumed great significance in the life of German universities within the framework of the general studies; they have been helped by a generally excellent openmindedness, capability, and sense of responsibility of the student pastor. The student groups will be even more worthwhile if they resist the temptation to close themselves into small groups of comrades in faith, who acknowledge only each other; if they submit the question of education and individual fields of study and life to religious criticism in cooperation of other faiths and non-Christians; and, if they are not satisfied with either the division into professionals and good Christians, or lull themselves to sleep in a Christian security which disregards the aspects of uncertainty in the historical situation. Only when we break through all the partial and preliminary questions to the religious meaning of the crisis which has become evident in the German universities, can we gradually arrive at an acknowledged answer and a new beginning. This cannot be brought about by institutional and organizational means alone.

The Christian, the University, and a Communist Land

CHARLES C. WEST

Europe traditionally has prided herself on the freedom of her academic life. Only perfunctory examinations bedevil the student in his pursuit of knowledge, until he is prepared to present the whole fruit of his study to the authorities who admit him to the profession of his choice. No one checks his attendance at lectures, his progress, his motives, his private life. He may seek such private fellowship as suits him, or none at all. The professor likewise submits to no discipline save that which his subject imposes on him. His freedom to pursue his subject is unlimited, save by the formalities of certain lectures and seminars. No one asks about the integration of the whole body of learning which the university contains. No one asks about its community life, or about the personal relations of faculty and students. There are, to be sure, many creative links between scholars, and much discussion, with a view to seeking truth in its more inclusive aspects. The ideal of scholarly detachment from the necessity of social application, is continually modified. Many fine personal attachments grow up between a scholar and his "Schuler"—a word with a connotation halfway between student and disciple. In old Germany (and sometimes in new Germany, too) the mystical nationalistic "Corporation" takes over the community life of the students. But these things are regarded as secondary to the university itself, which is a place where knowledge is pursued in unrestricted freedom.

TOTALITARIANISMS AND THE UNIVERSITY

Such was the picture of the university, which crumbled under the attack of Nazism. We need not tell this story again here. It is important today for the universities in East Germany mainly because they have had no respite from dictatorial control since 1933. In the West new minds have arisen since the war and older professors ousted in Nazi times for their convictions have returned. In East Germany the faculties are composed of old men appointed before 1933 who, for one reason or another, weathered the Nazi period (often by certain gestures toward Nazism, or by studiously ignoring politics), the men whom the Nazis appointed who, for one reason or other have weathered denazification, and the men appointed under the Soviet occupation. The same applies to books. The mighty Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, once one of the world's leading research libraries, contains every book printed in the German language in modern times—until 1936. And as it is with professors and books, so also with the cross-currents of intellectual life. The date 1936 might well be set, as the last year in which there was free intellectual

Charles C. West, for some years a Presbyterian missionary in China and more recently a Fraternal Worker in Berlin, Germany, with the World Council of Churches, is on furlough in the United States and completing his post-graduate studies at Yale Divinity School.

THE CHRISTIAN, THE UNIVERSITY, AND A COMMUNIST LAND

communication between the great centers of Berlin, Leipzig, Halle, Jena, Rostock, Greifswald, and the rest of the world.

We must not however underestimate the power of a great academic tradition. Despite Hitler and Stalin, many departments in these universities have succeeded in maintaining their standards, and in finding qualified younger teachers. Especially in the post-war period, the prestige of the professor has been sufficient to give him a certain protection against ordinary political pressures. Books have been imported despite the desires of two dictatorships often, due to a curious twist of the regulations, with official permission. The professional standards of German academic training are rooted in the previous century and a half. They have proved their excellence in almost every field. Especially in the sciences, where well-trained men are essential to the production and health of the economy, even the Communists dare not interfere with them too drastically. Arts faculties, to be sure, have been nearly destroyed by Communist reforms. Faculties of Law are now non-existent in the pre-Communist sense. The social sciences have been reformed into training courses for Marx-Leninist ideology, although in the applied fields (agricultural economy, statistics et al.) some independence still prevails. But in the other fields—medicine, natural sciences, education, and theology, for example—the condition of the faculty depends to a large extent on the faculty itself, its depth of knowledge, its courage and its tact, and its wisdom and independence of spirit.

The Communists have conducted a concerted attack on all the universities. Their aim is to make them centers of progressive learning in the Communist sense, to: "Provide students with a grasp of the laws governing the evolution of nature and society, and to educate them to be tireless fighters for peace and the progress of mankind" (from the *Ordinance* of August 4, 1951, establishing sociological study as basic to the curriculum). In this interest they have changed the curriculum, scholarship support, and the manner of study fundamentally. Sociology in the Communist sense, has been established as a compulsory basic course for all students of all courses. This is Marx-Leninist indoctrination, extending through all four years. Added to it are compulsory Russian for most faculties, and compulsory courses in dialectical materialism, history, Russian literature, and other such subjects for some. In many departments these courses fill half of the student's schedule. The term has been lengthened and attendance at all lectures and seminars is now checked. The school year starts on September 6, and runs, with short holidays, until May 6. Examinations in all subjects follow, and a period of practical service in the student's future field of work follows this, until July 10. Professors are expected to teach according to syllabi in all subjects, no longer according to their own research or desire. The result of all this is a speed-up in academic life. The syllabi are often impossibly large. The subjects of the student's study per se are crowded into a portion of their former time, by the study of Marx-Leninist compulsory materials. A weekly schedule of 25 hours is not unusual for a student,

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

even if he does not take electives. Added to this is the activity of the Free German Youth on the campus, participation in which is only euphemistically "voluntary."

SCHOLARSHIPS, ORGANIZATIONS, AND TEACHING

This pressure is increased by the system of scholarships, which gives the whole system its hidden political control. A few, favored students can get scholarships of up to 400 East Marks per month. The average is nearer 150 East Marks per month for students who pass their examinations with "good." Students coming out of certain classes (children of workers, small farmers, professors, "creative intelligentsia," "heroes of labor," etc.) average nearer 200. Since a minimum living standard for a student is around 120 East Marks per month, this kind of support amounts to a wage for studying, and it would not be untrue to Communist thinking to call them "intellectual workers." However, this scholarship can be withdrawn when at any time the student fails to maintain an average mark of 2.2 (in a range of 1 - excellent, to 5 - failure). At least one of the subjects tested is always an ideological one in which the student must reveal where he stands politically, both in writing and in oral examination. In theory, these examinations are on the subject matter, and not tests of opinion. But this distinction, basic for the Evangelical Church's whole struggle with Communist authorities over the conscience of its children in the educational system, does not exist in the Communist ideology. To master Marx-Leninist ideology as an objective subject matter with which one does not identify oneself, is the crime of "objectivism" in Communist eyes—"piling facts on facts without discovering their inner relations and without using them to support a progressive standpoint." It helps, therefore, to know one's facts, but if one remains free in point of view one always risks failing a social science examination. This failure may ruin the average sufficiently to deprive the student of his scholarship.

There is finally the pressure of Communist organizations—the Free German Youth, the Socialist Unity (Communist) Party, and in the case of the Christians, the special pressure of the puppet East Christian Democratic Union. It is only the exceptionally courageous and intelligent student who can stay free of one of these organizations, and the possibility is decreasing year by year. Within them, however, the student is caught not only in demonstrations, petitions, and other political action, but also in a system of mutual espionage, and discipline. Expulsion from the Free German Youth usually carries with it expulsion from the university itself. In the first half of 1953 when members of the Evangelical Studentengemeinde (Student Church, under the Evangelical Church in Germany) were under direct attack "for espionage on behalf of American imperialism," most of the proceedings against these Christian students were brought in the meetings of the Free German Youth. Fear of this kind of discipline, with the virulent propaganda in the public press which accompanies it, makes the student often susceptible to service as an informer on other students in classroom and elsewhere.

THE CHRISTIAN, THE UNIVERSITY, AND A COMMUNIST LAND

This is the atmosphere in which the universities exist in East Germany today. It meets, as we have seen, with the resistance of an academic community with long traditions of high scholarship standards, and free, even irresponsible individualism in inquiry and habits of life. These standards and this individualism are so bred into the university in East Germany that they cannot be eradicated by rules and threats alone. The Communists are slowly training up their own type of teacher in their own training schools—especially for social sciences. They have formed their own "Workers and Peasants Colleges" within the universities, where students live almost under military discipline and surveillance. (Practically none of these students, for example, are to be found in the otherwise large and vigorous evangelical Studentendemeinden). But the abilities of these new teachers, and the standard of education in these colleges, are often such as to make them both unattractive. It is mainly where the older professors have fled or have quit under pressure that the Communists are able to take over a department or a school with their own people. Despite the syllabi, older teachers continue to teach, in many cases, what they believe the student should know. A good student is often brought through his examinations, despite a poor showing in social science, by professors who are interested in him. Where a group of instructors in one faculty remains uninfiltrated by Communists, an education in the traditional style and of traditional quality may still be possible. The weapon of academic standards is still a powerful one. The pressure, however, is great enough so that successors to the present professors, with independent mind and spirit are rarities, and where they do appear, are inclined to accept a call in West Germany. East Germany is being drained of its academic leadership only partly by Communist pressure. The other factor is the attraction of the West, and the very human desire to escape the tensions of fear, despair, and insecurity.

HAS THE SCHOLAR A VOCATION?

Is there, then, still a place for constructive academic work in the East German university? Is there a vocation there? This depends on one's faith and perspective. One can make a case for it on the basis of the traditional individualistic ideals of creative scholarship. So one professor in a revealingly pathetic exchange of correspondence with a friend in West Germany explains it: "We bind our existence to the task of remaining in the East Zone. We do not deny that there is a difference between East and West Germany. We deny that Europe (in culture and spirit) has no future in Russia or in the East Zone. Not politics, but existence, is our work."*

He points out that the professor in East Germany is in a favored position to continue his scholarly work if he does not mix in politics. A minimal acknowl-

* This exchange, with comments by religious and educational leaders, is contained in *Die Situation der Entscheidung*, a pamphlet distributed by the Bundesministerium für Gesamtdeutsche Fragen, Bonn, Germany, 1952.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

edgment of government authority and principles suffices. He sees a return of the universities to an emphasis on objective scholarship, separated from the ideological study which continues parallel. Evidence for this lies in the reinstatement of certain "bourgeois" subjects in the curriculum, such as in philosophy, logic, or psychology, the success of certain bourgeois professors in defying Marx-Leninism and the like. To be sure, a sacrifice is made. The non-Communist professor lives like one whose home is in the west. He dare not be creative openly: "I sacrifice the free productivity of my spirit to the level of my material existence." He reads in the culture of the West, but in private. He can do nothing against the great power movements of his time. Yet, as he sees it, intellectuals such as he have a vocation—that of a "holding resistance (*hinhaltende Widerstand*)."¹ Not everyone whose spirit is not Communist can flee the East Zone. Some must stay in order that the cultural traditions of the West may persist. This staying and this resistance is not active; nor is it passive resistance in the traditional sense. It is resistance at certain limited points, where it can be effective—a tactic of continual small hindrances, of support which by its very manner frustrates the aims of the Communists. The professor believes that the West, with all its military power and technical ability lives, in large part, from this kind of holding out on the part of people in the East. "You will understand when I say that my whole existence here, that of my family, my assistants, and many of my students, is nothing else than the determined and conscious form of this holding out."

This vocation was vigorously contested by the professor's friend, a refugee professor in West Germany. He was shocked that his friend had willingly sacrificed his free creativity: "You throw over, with that sacrifice, the whole western concept of the spirit!" He disputes that the professor is so free of being used by the Communists as he imagines, since he teaches in a Communist-controlled institution, and Communist theory can explain his failure to conform his scholarship to Marx-Leninism "dialectically", thereby neutralizing the influence of that scholarship. Furthermore, outward conformity and inward *Hinhaltung* can only be temporary. The Communists have ways of breaking down such people eventually. Furthermore, the power which controls East Germany is a generalized power, and is therefore not susceptible to pinpricks. So this form of *Hinhaltung* is possible for a while, but "how long can it last without injury to one's self? And injury to oneself, we will surely agree on this, is not a possibility to be considered."

Both of these men are rationalists. Both find in Christianity a dogmatism which is of the same nature as Bolshevism, and in rationalism the only alternative. Their concept of western freedom and culture is of this sort—free rational inquiry and creativity. Because the superior technical and scientific culture of the West is necessary to the Communists, so that they cannot completely enslave it to their ideology, the professor from the East feels that he has room for a vocation. Because he holds this to be a dangerous illusion, the western professor urges his eastern colleague to flee.

THE CHRISTIAN, THE UNIVERSITY, AND A COMMUNIST LAND

THE DEEPER SEARCH: RESPONSIBLE SCHOLARSHIP

The pathos of this exchange lies in the blindness of both sides to the depth of the issues they confront, and the judgment which this blindness brings on the traditional concept of a university. Neither of the men spends a word on the responsibility of the professor for his fellow human beings—his students, the people who are affected by his example and teaching in society as a whole, and the community of which he is a part. Neither considers the challenge of Marx-Leninism as *an ideology*, an integration of truth which requires at least as integrating a faith to stand up against it. But the most pathetic note is both men's careful exclusion of "self-injury" as a possibility. With this they place themselves in a dream world, for no man lives an independent life in East Germany today, unless he has made his terms with prison or death, and reckons with them as real meaningful possibilities. "*Hinhaltung*" is either coupled with open witness at the proper time, or it becomes indeed a tool of Communist power. Both men find in Christian eschatology the use of future hope to enslave man in the present, yet they themselves have no hope to offer to others not so fortunate as they.

The fact is that the university, as these two men conceive it, stands under the judgment of God for its failure to become in the true sense *universitas*. One can see in the events of university reform under Communist pressure in East Germany the operation of this judgment. What sense of Truth in its wholeness gave the Communists pause when they approached the university to impose their ideology on it? What kept them from isolating and picking off individual specialists one by one? What tradition of social responsibility among professors and students competed with the Communist one? What did the student aim at besides the status which his specialization would give him? How did the professor use his talents to serve society and prevent social misuse of his scholarship? What fellowship existed among the students to render the Workers and Peasants Colleges unnecessary?

In the light of these questions, we must ask—is there a Christian vocation in the East German university today? Let us be clear first about its foundations. A Christian vocation in East Germany cannot be founded on pragmatic considerations. If one calculates the possibilities for effective research and teaching, or the chances as a student of secure and creative employment in the field of one's choice, then there is no hope in the Eastern university. Neither can the Christian vocation be thought of in terms of the promotion of Christian ideals or view of life. The integration of a world-view around a Christian-philosophical center is not possible. If a Christian is to teach in a university under communism without surrendering his faith, it must be because of the call and promise of God. The work is insecure. Life and liberty are at stake in every lecture or student contact. It is without hope in the earthly sense; and for this reason it must be informed with a more lively hope in that which God will accomplish in the Spirit of Christ among students and even Party functionaries. It is frustrating work, poorly nourished by books or

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

free discussion; therefore, the Christian teacher must be more acutely sensitive to every current of the spirit which God's grace sends his way. It is work in an atmosphere of hypocrisy, hatred, and fear which turn the mind from its task; so it must be attacked from the living truth of God's reconciling love in Christ. Without these foundations and without this faith, one might well ask, who could find a vocation in the university or anywhere else in a Communist land?

CHRISTIAN ACTION IN THE UNIVERSITY

When this is once said, however, the university offers unique opportunities for Christian action, especially at three points:

First, the Studentengemeinde—the Student Church—becomes, in a limited way, the custodian of the *universitas*, which the Communist ideology is destroying. There free questions may be asked in an atmosphere of mutual trust; they are no longer in place in the classroom. There the broader questions of life may be asked, which go beyond immediate specialization. One Studentengemeinde, for example, sponsored a lecture series on "What is Man" from the point of view of various sciences, and philosophy. The speakers were Christians. Another has a number of study groups in which students of different faculties discuss the meaning of their professions. Here, and in countless open evenings and informal gatherings, students recapture something of the breadth and variety of Truth, and share their opinions in relative freedom.

Second, the professor of a subject which is necessary to the national economy, and indeed other professors—of theology, philosophy, or education, for example—has a greater opportunity than any other man in the Soviet Zone to challenge Marx-Leninism, and to help his students find a basis of thinking and action independent of it. This opportunity can be easily lost. The professor is always tempted to retreat into the more technical aspects of his subject, leaving the social implications and problems alone. It is easy for him to forget personal contact with his students. But there are a few who take up this challenge. Their method is based on the belief that no ideology (not even a "Christian" one) can prevail over the facts of life which Christ gives us freedom to see as they are. It is a Christian vocation to defend the autonomy of these facts in the East Zone today, and of the structure of thought which the subject itself requires. It is the vocation of the Christian professor to understand thoroughly what the Communists are doing in his field, and what they intend, and to interpret this process from a basis independent of Communism. This will mean that he may approve some Communist measures and disapprove others. But in both cases he will liberate his students from dependence on Marx-Leninism for their criteria of judgment. And in the case of what he disapproves, this will be founded in knowledge of his subject and of Communism itself, which cannot help but carry weight.

"Why," asked one such man of a Communist leader, "do you allow usbour-

THE CHRISTIAN, THE UNIVERSITY, AND A COMMUNIST LAND

geois professors to continue to influence students whom you are trying to win?"

"When you were teaching engineering in a bourgeois capitalist society," replied the Communist, "your teaching contributed to the strength of reactionary capitalist exploitation of the people. But now the material base of society has changed, even though the state of your consciousness has not caught up with it. Although your state of mind is reactionary, your technical teaching contributes whether you will or not, to the construction of a socialist society."

"If you imagine it to be so," replied the teacher, "I accept the challenge. I believe differently about the base of society."

Such a professor will turn out men into the professions—medicine, industry, agriculture and the like—with grounded independence of ideology in their subject. And so far as they catch the spirit of their teacher, they will have the courage and faith to use their influence as God wills.

Third, professors and students, and this means in practice Christian ones because there is no other non-Communist center of life, can accomplish a number of things against the general pressure in the university. A university is more susceptible to the question of truth than another center. The traditional prestige of the professor gives him a certain influence. This showed itself, for example, during the persecution of the Studentengemeinde in the spring of 1953. In more than one meeting of the Free German Youth for the purpose of expelling active Christian students, the professors succeeded in preventing action by their presence, by their speeches, and sometimes by ostentatiously walking out of the meeting. Many regulations concerning propaganda study have fallen by the way, because a faculty refused to take them up. Many a student has been protected by an interested teacher despite his politics. But the main accomplishments of Christian action here will never be fully recorded. They consist in thousands of personal contacts; of Christian students speaking the truth in a group where no one else had dared to speak, and creating thereby freedom and trust; of discussions which Christians dared to carry on when others found it more expedient to keep silent; of petty Communists and half-Communists made uncertain in their ways, and pricked in their conscience by the undeserved friendship and open criticism of these followers of another Kingdom than the Socialist State.

"This Communist man, so completely irreligious, has a fine ear for the voice of the living God, who is the Orderer, Judge and Saviour for all. What takes place in these quiet and hidden meetings which he has with Christians is, in fact, the most important event of our times. Here it becomes evident that there is no counter-force against the clearly present Gospel, and that these estranged fanatics who seem to be in another world, are standing close to Faith—much, much closer than our bourgeois citizenry as long as they were undisturbed. The divine sword smashes tirelessly the ideological armor. If only all Christians would take it in their hand!" (University Pastor Johannes Hamel, *Die Neue Furche*, May, 1951).

South-East Asian Society and its University

MIKIO SUMIYA



THE RELATION OF ASIA to the West has undergone a basic change, as everyone knows, since the end of the Second World War. In the new situation, the position of the University is especially noteworthy, because it is the place where the Asian and Western civilization meet. The University has long been the thoroughfare through which Western civilization has found its way into Asian society. But, the modern Universities of Asia are new; they were built within the last hundred years under the direct influence of various Western countries. The differences in the higher educational systems in these countries which held a ruling or influential role are, therefore, also reflected in the types of modern Asian universities. The Indian University, for example, is Anglo-sized, while the Japanese University, once patterned largely on the German type, is now Americanized. This fact makes difficult our speaking of *the Asian University en bloc*; but, compared with its Western counterpart, certain evidences of unity can be pointed out.

WHAT IS ASIA?

As it is difficult to speak of *the University* in Asia, so also it is difficult to speak of *Asia* in terms of a unified concept. In the post-war situation, Asia attracts the notice of the world as socially unified—she rises against her subordinate position, she possesses a traditional civilization, and she struggles with an underdeveloped society. Intuitively one can “see” homogeneous factors in Asia, and we can point out some which are common to South-East Asia. But, *Asia is not one!* Even where the same script is used, as for example in Japan and China—leading some Westerners to conclude that these are signs that the countries are reasonably homogeneous—a view which suggests that Asia is, therefore, a unity is only a superficial judgment.

According to the social scientist, the most distinctive common characteristic of Asia is its stagnancy. Two centuries ago, Montesquieu pointed out in his *De L'esprit de lois*, and Adam Smith in his *Wealth of Nations*, that Asia's situation is stationary. Why has Asia been so portrayed—when actually Asian countries have longer histories of civilization than the Western countries? And, why does Asia play a subordinate role to the more recently developed West? First, it must be pointed out that Asia has not been totally static; it has undergone many social and historical changes. The special character of the development of Japan, for example, during the past ninety years has been marked by the co-existence of an heterogeneous historical structure. In Western society older social systems may

Mikio Sumiya is assistant professor of Economics at Tokyo National University. He is a former member of the Executive Committee of the Student Department of the National Committee of the Y.M.C.A. in Japan. As a young Christian university teacher, he now serves as the Chairman of the University Commission in Japan.

SOUTH-EAST ASIAN SOCIETY AND ITS UNIVERSITY

remain, but they are negligible when new ones emerge and become dominant; the older structures are only remnants in the historical succession. In Japanese society, on the contrary, the older social systems remain dominant and the changes which take place are on the outer circles of the total society. New forms do not emerge to challenge the older ones, and older systems check developments of newer forms. This gives the impression that the advance of society is slow and that Asia seems rather stagnant.

This is, generally, true of all Asian countries. Tradition has great power and it is the most remarkable feature in the entire society. The co-existence of these traditional cultures and the Western "super-impositions" of the new upon the old (as an Indian philosopher has called these) form the syncretism which is another basic characteristic of modern Asian cultures. Syncretism originally meant the attempt to subdue differences and effect union between basic religious and philosophical ideas. It is doubtful, however, whether this is actually true in modern Asia. Something of what sociologists call "acculturation" does, of course, take place, but in Asia this is not a mixture but rather the existence of different kinds of culture side by side with one another. This feature must therefore be called "co-existence" or "super-imposition" and not "syncretism." In India, China, and Japan the differences of religions and philosophies are somewhat superficial; behind them there is a unity and an aim toward the oneness of truth. In such a situation, one structure of ideas rarely struggles with another and almost all structures can co-exist. This is the foundation of "super-imposition" and also, to an extent, of syncretism.

At present, the most important constituents of co-existence are the Western ideas and the traditional Asian cultures. Moreover, within the traditional cultures we can distinguish two factors, the antique and the feudal. Such is the South-East Asian cultural situation today. The fact that Asia is not a simple unity makes for the difficulty in solving Asia's cultural problems.

WHAT IS THE ASIAN UNIVERSITY?

In such a complex society, what is the University? First of all, we may repeat that the University is one of the most Westernized institutions in Asian society. Students learn the ways of Western living, of viewing their surroundings through an awakened reason, and of scientific reasoning. They also criticize these, for the gap between reason's way of thinking and the traditional forms is great. Thus, as long as the Universities, as the communities of intellectuals, are rational, they form a special circle within the traditional Asian society and have no deep roots within it. Asia has its "homeless intellectuals."

This poses the dilemma. The intellectuals find serious problems in their society—poverty, darkness, and slavery. An uneasy conscience arises. The awakened intellectuals want to solve the problems. i. e., to establish their new home. This shows

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

the contrast between the Asian and the Western University, because the latter serves its social function by helping the present society to work well, and this makes the Western University fundamentally conservative. On the contrary, the Asian University is radical in its social function; it has been one of the main centers of radical political movements, a force for independence, and the supply-line for the leaders of such movements and forces. The main thrust of the pre-war Chinese anti-imperialist movement, for example, was composed of University students; and, in the May-day riot of the year before last in Tokyo, students took a leading part. More positively, too, the desirable means for change in various Asian countries—legislation, engineering, and medical science, for example—are also found in the Universities, and students are eager to learn and practice the new techniques which are necessary to build the new society. Universities, therefore, serve as the thoroughfare through which Western (and in some cases, Russian) ideas flow into Asian society. This is why we may conclude that the University is nationalistic and political in its meaning for Asian culture.

The Asian University, as the "realm of reason," is eager to absorb Western scientific rationalism. It is a way of awakening the people and of establishing the new nation. But, because it is so enthusiastic about the scientific method, it does not reflect upon the limits of rationalism; it tends to make reason absolute. But, this is due largely to the fact that rationalism is useful to Asian nations; and, for this reason the sciences of law, technology, and medicine are more appreciated than the purely theoretical natural and social sciences. Thus, the basic attitude of the Asian University is also utilitarian.

The Asian University, moreover, tends to mould a new type of man—the rational man. In Asia the change may be rather superficial, for in the Asian the traditional type of man survives strongly. Thus, a double way of living is very common for the Asian professors and students: in the University they are scientific and rationalistic, and in the home and society they are traditional and irrational. In this manner the mental structure of Asian intellectuals super-imposes a rationalism upon their irrationalism, and sometimes all unity is lost between them. It is a characteristic of the Asian intellectual, therefore, that he is able to hold to contradictory ideas at the same time.

THE SPECIAL SITUATION OF THE ASIAN UNIVERSITY

The present concern in the Western world over disunity, the breakdown of old values, and the increase of split personalities has reflected itself in the fear which many have that the University, too, has lost its integrity. Many speak of the urgent need of rediscovering its integrating factors. In the Asian University, where the developments of modern science proceeded without firm grounding in culture, the influence of scientific rationalism should have been serious indeed. But, in fact, this is not felt and there is no great urgency to find new sources of in-

SOUTH-EAST ASIAN SOCIETY AND ITS UNIVERSITY

tegrity. The Asian university believes in rationalism as the satisfactory basis of all the sciences. It is therefore still living in the expectation of the work of reason, while the West is disappointed in its work. Independent Asians are hopeful and cannot understand the reasons for Western nihilism. The Asian has few dark shadows in his way of living, while the Americans have many. Only Japanese intellectuals may turn to the dark philosophies, because they feel that they have been brought to a standstill in modern civilization. But in general, Asian Christian professors agree that rationality is the fundamental and most important factor in the present-day University and society of Asia, even though reason cannot be followed by Christians as absolute.

This fact is closely linked with another, which is also difficult for many in the West to understand: the demand for the secularization of the University. For many Western Christians, faith is conceived as the key to the solution of the fragmentary nature of the University. For Asian Christians, on the other hand, the secularism of society and especially of the University is a basic claim. This is due to the fact that in Asian countries the old traditions of theocracy have remained; they have checked the development of society and of rational procedures; they have suppressed freedom of thought and academic activity. Asia's "religious society" has been a main reason for its backwardness as a society and the misery of its people. In Japan, where university education prevailed, Shintoist theocracy was influential until the end of the Second World War; in Siam, Buddhist theocracy has been dominant; in Pakistan and Indonesia, Islamic theocracy may be the danger, while in India a Hinduist theocracy may reign. Thus, only as there is a break with the theocratic way of living and thinking, can there be freedom of learning, of thought, and of faith.

A DANGER IN THE ASIAN UNIVERSITY

We have already noted that the University, though primarily modern, is nevertheless influenced by traditional culture. This is particularly revealed in the role of the University as nationalistic. There we must distinguish between modern and traditional nationalism. Modern nationalism, like the European nationalism of the modern period, aims to build democratic nations by breaking down traditional social and political patterns. Traditional nationalism is the chauvinistic and super-nationalistic force which insists upon keeping the prevailing cultural and social structure. The nationalism of the Asian university was originally the modern form. However, the stronger the traditional nationalism is in culture generally, the deeper is its influence upon the University. Then, the traditional social basis becomes the dominant force in the community of reason. This has been particularly illustrated in Japan. There have, of course, been successive endeavors to keep the modern mind at work in the University, but frequently the strong trends of tradition could not be checked. If the Asian University would fulfill the request

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

of history, it must overcome this danger of being absorbed by traditionalism; it must form the rational man, though, in the West, rationality is suffering from arteriosclerosis. In Asia, rationalism is the strongest power with which to confront traditionalism. But, more than this: reason is essential to the healthy integrity of both persons and the University in Asia. As the Asian is sometimes indifferent to co-existence of different ideas and views within him, diminishing his personal integrity, so he must not be permitted to become one-sided and absolutistic. It is the fundamental task of the Asian university to help students to become self-awakened to their integral personality whose most important function is reason.

Toward a Responsible University

PAUL J. BRAISTED



THE ASIAN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS' Consultation held at Bandung, Indonesia in December 1951 was the culmination of meetings of Christian teachers over a period of five years in the Philippines, Japan, Ceylon and South India. These discussions were developed by leaders of the several Student Christian Movements and the University Commission of the World's Student Christian Federation. The primary stimulus to these developments was Sir Walter Moberly's book, *The Crisis in the University*. The reports of the various meetings reveal both the deep impact of the Moberly volume upon the thinking of these Asian Christian teachers, and an early divergence from certain of its assumptions. Gradually there developed a sharp reaction to the discussions that had taken place in other parts of the world and a strong conviction that these viewpoints were not immediately or wholly relevant to the situations in the several Asian countries. It was this keen awareness of the unique problems and opportunities of Asian universities that led to formulation of the concept of a responsible university which became the focus of subsequent discussion. In going over the records one is impressed by the eager outreach of these teachers both for a better understanding of the role of universities in the past and for a clearer formulation of the appropriate role of universities in the new Asia. It is this quest for relevance by educators speaking from widely differing situations throughout Asia that makes this series of inquiries unique among the discussions thus far promoted by the Federation. It is because of this that a study of these discussions may prove both informative and instructive to western teachers and educators.

The Idea of a Responsible University in Asia Today is a report of the Bandung meetings published by the Federation. It is presented in two parts: first, an interpretation by M. M. Thomas and second, the addresses, reports and summaries of the conference itself. Thirty-four persons took part in this consultation, about half of whom were professors, lecturers, deans or principals of colleges and universities. The other half were leaders of the various Student Christian Movements in the lands represented. The educators were about evenly divided between those working in private and in public colleges or universities. Delegates attended as individuals rather than as representatives of institutions. They came from Japan and India and the several countries between them, thus representing experience in widely differing cultural situations. Likewise, they came from colleges and universities reflecting the educational traditions and experience of different western peoples. Three chairmen presided over the sessions: Professor Mikio

Dr. Paul J. Braisted is President of the Edward W. Hazen Foundation, which has been actively supporting the work of the University Commission in Asia. The volume, entitled *The Idea of a Responsible University in Asia Today*, has been reprinted; it is available through the United Student Christian Council, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y., or from the Federation's Geneva office.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

Sumiya of Tokyo, Dr. J. Leimena of Djakarta and Principal D. G. Moses of Hislop College, Nagpur, to whose significant paper reference is made below. The theme of the conference was subdivided into four topics: 1. The University's Responsibility in Ideological Conflict in Asia; 2. The University's Responsibility to Society in Asia; 3. The University's Responsibility to the Truth; 4. The University as Community.

In his summary of the conference Mr. Thomas describes it as a pioneering venture with a promise of large subsequent development. He emphasizes a certain impatience which developed in the meeting as between those who "know what a university is" and those who haven't yet arrived at a definition. He describes the sharpest difference between spokesmen of the East and the West as follows:

"The main point of difference arose, I think, from the different stages of development of Asian and Western societies in relation to the liberal, secular and rational values. The West is at the end of the Renaissance and the Reformation, while Asia is at the beginning and rationalism and secularism stand in many countries of Asia for the liberation of the human from the irrational impersonality of an ancient static collectivism; while therefore, Asians are thankful for the caution against the pagan spirit of liberal and scientific rationalism, they see in them positive values to be affirmed in the name of the truly personal and human in this present stage of Asian social history."

This viewpoint is developed at some length in his interpretation of the discussions. It is this which makes the report particularly illuminating for western readers who may find instruction here both relative to the rapidly changing social scene in Asian countries and to the nature of the university itself.

THE UNIVERSITY, SECULARISM, AND CULTURE

The strong emphasis upon "the positive meaning of secularism" will, doubtless, seem strange to many western readers for whom "secularism" is the discredited end product of a decline of faith in religion and humane values. But is it not too easy for westerners in these times to forget how important such an affirmation of positive values was in our own earlier struggles for freedom from ecclesiastical or political tyrannies? Among students in some of these Asian countries prior to the second World War the issue of political independence tended to crowd out active consideration of many other important questions. Now, in these days of independence all the cultural, social and political issues are of immediate concern and leaders and people alike look to the universities as centers of teaching and scholarship, of training and leadership. Hence their role is crucial. It is small wonder then that Christian teachers as well as others, recognize the importance of the fact that "secularism will give a supporting climate to rational activities." Everywhere they confront the need for affirmation of the reality and purpose of secular life and the need for establishment of the autonomy of secular

TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY

pursuits as a firm basis for essential recognition and development of rationality and science. It is this which supports the claim of these teachers that "we are advocating secularity for the sake of a healthy university and a rational society." Here is ample ground for reflection and debate in both East and West.

This emphasis also has an immediate relevance for the Christian teacher in the West wherever intellectual freedom is threatened. Here is a vivid reminder that high religion cannot thrive where the rational is disparaged, where demands for conformity of whatever sort stifle man's essential freedom. Here is a word of caution to western Christian educators who in their zeal to reclaim a fair place for religion in American higher education may be tempted at times to undervalue rationality. Here is a common meeting-ground for the Christian teachers of Asia and of the West in recognition that religious faith and intellectual enterprise belong together and depend fundamentally upon each other for their healthy development. It would be difficult to define a more fundamental and crucial issue for higher education anywhere.

The responsibility of the universities to society which was an all-prevading theme of these discussions has many aspects. Perhaps the greatest emphasis was given to the necessity for the attainment of justice for the human person. This task is found to be extremely difficult and complex since the dignity of man must be affirmed against both "the older, cultural collectivisms and the newer western collectivisms" at one and the same time. In such a framework the struggle for religious freedom and for intellectual freedom are one and the same effort. Furthermore, each university has an inescapable role to play in education for nationhood and for democracy. It must give meaning and relevance to the concept "democracy" and it must train leaders for the many tasks upon which its progressive fulfillment ultimately depends. Still another important aspect of this responsibility derives from awakened nationalism which seeks to re-define its ancient culture. Here the scholars of the university have a crucial role to play in seeking out the lasting values of the culture which may become part of a new synthesis with fresh relevance within the new democratic society. From all these considerations there arises the urgent need to define clearly the varied tasks and opportunities of the universities and thus to come to a clearer understanding of their meaning within the rapidly changing cultures of Asia.

These varied university problems are under discussion by responsible educators everywhere one finds colleges and universities. All educators in these universities whom one encounters are acutely aware of the many urgent pressures and demands upon them. Most are aware that this situation requires careful appraisal of the university's role and wise deployment of limited resources relative to specific and immediate tasks. But one seldom encounters as penetrating analysis of the underlying and fundamental need within society as is revealed in these discussions. An important beginning has been made which deserves careful develop-

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

ment. This is especially significant since although these teachers belong to a minority group in their several countries they are seeking not merely the interests of their group but the larger welfare of society as a whole. A deeper appreciation of the situation in these universities, of the vast scope of their tasks and the fundamental nature of their contemporary social contribution would help greatly toward a better understanding of these governments and peoples. And such understanding would tend to substitute patience and sympathy for the too-harsh judgments sometimes passed upon the educators of Asia on the basis of standards and experience developed to meet cultural situations in European and American circumstances in other days.

One of the most important and penetrating discussions to be found among the papers of the Bandung meeting was written by Principal Moses on "The University's Responsibility to Truth." He points out that most of the modern universities of Asia have been developed on one or another western model and, therefore, are importations. These institutions brought modern science and introduced democracy through study of western literatures. All of this has been a powerful stimulus of cultural ferment. He then goes on to describe both democracy and science as exotic plants without strong indigenous cultural roots. He finds that the theoretical presuppositions of science are alien to inherited ideals, mainly those concerned with the concept of the nature of man. This has resulted, he believes, in a superimposition of ideas, the new upon the old, without sufficient critical examination. Nationalism, furthermore, is a revolutionary force affecting the family and the masses, as well as individuals. Similar emphases were made in a paper describing the situation of the Japanese universities. In it the writer described a deep involvement in social conflict arising from new emphases on freedom with far-reaching political implications and fresh interpretations of the nature of man in relation to the older concepts of society. Both writers as well as other speakers in the conference find the Christian affirmation on the nature of man perhaps the most important single contribution they can make to the clarification of the aims and meaning of the university.

THE EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THESE CONCERNS

The significance of these discussions may also be further appraised against the background of the various programs of higher education throughout Asia. As indicated above, the Bandung meeting reflected situations in countries from India on the west to Japan on the east. Many, indeed most of these universities which are so intimately involved in social and political change are also related to various educational traditions of the West. Thus, one finds in Ceylon, Singapore and Hong Kong the pattern of the older British universities; in India and Burma that of the University of London, and, in the Philippines the varied reflection of long association with American education as well as earlier European patterns. Some

TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY

of the modern universities are nearly one hundred years old, while others have been established since the second World War. There is wide divergence in size from the University of Calcutta, one of thirty in India, with its more than 30,000 students reading in 60 colleges, to others with a few hundred or several thousand students. Personal conferences with Ministers of Education, Vice Chancellors, teachers, as well as persons with university experience now engaged in other activities, impressed the writer last year with both the profound relevance of the Bandung discussions and certain limitations of them. Everywhere one encountered a friendly spirit and the frankest comment concerning the present problems of university education and one gained a vivid impression of many competent educators working quietly and imaginatively often with tragically limited resources. In the perspective of these many conversations one can make several general observations.

Since one's first impression of the Bandung discussions is of their fundamental importance in the cultural situation of the several countries, it was rather surprising, even shocking, to hear one of the most experienced Christian educators in India remark that the discussions of the "university question" had been useful but had served their purpose and should be terminated. What he meant, of course, was that a goodly number of Christian teachers had studied Moberly, thought about the nature and role of the university and come to a clearer understanding of their role as Christian teachers. On reflection he conceded that there might still be a useful task to be performed since there were many Christian teachers who had not participated in such discussions and since young teachers would be coming into there are many Christian colleges where such discussions had not yet been developed, although some have done so recently. Furthermore, one of the suggestions the Christian colleges who had had no such opportunity. In addition, however, that grew out of the Bandung meeting was for more interchange among the Christian teachers of the different countries through intervisitation and other means. Thus there would seem to be important opportunities for continuation of the discussion among Christian teachers and the encouragement of international exchange would seem to be a role for which the Federation might well take a continuing responsibility.

But these discussions at their best are explorations of issues which are a primary concern of all educators in the several countries. A more important problem, therefore, is how the thought of these discussions can be shared with other educators in the colleges and universities. Again, taking India as an illustration, Christian colleges and Christian teachers have in the past made a widely recognized excellent contribution to the development of higher education. In most Christian colleges, to be sure, Christian teachers are a minority of the faculty and, consequently, in daily contact with teachers who approach some of the fundamental problems from other points of view. It should not be difficult for imaginative

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

leadership to find numerous opportunities for fruitful discussion of the role of universities and teachers in the new day. Intercollegiate or university-wide discussions could be planned about special occasions or through the normal channels of educational and professional meetings. The important thing is that the discussions, so auspiciously launched, be extended into wider circles among the teachers of the various colleges. An impressive illustration appeared in one university where a Christian educator had found the means of engaging teachers from all the constituent colleges in vital discussion of a wide range of central problems of university education. He was, however, an exception, and one looked in vain for other similar developments. The enthusiastic response which he received demonstrated awareness of a need and that active interest can be rather easily aroused. His success was due to his prestige as a teacher and educator in the university and the community. This suggests that individuals rather than movements or institutions have the greatest opportunity. Enquiry by such Christian educators would lead naturally to conversations with educators of widely differing backgrounds and so to fresh initiatives.

THE CULTURAL TASK IN ASIA

A special aspect of universities which seek to serve the needs of the modern secular state in the context of older cultures is worthy of special mention here, namely, the place of religion in a university program. One occasionally hears proposals that Buddhist, Moslem or Hindu universities should be developed among the peoples where these faiths predominate as Christian universities have developed in other parts of the world. One may anticipate efforts to this end. But in the main, modern universities in Asian lands are public institutions of secular, democratic states. Of course the universities cannot and should not neglect the ancient cultures within which they exist and, by the same token, it is impossible for them to neglect religion which continues to be such an important and vital aspect of these cultures. One heard very little deliberate consideration of the problems posed by these demands upon the universities. So, the troublesome question arises,—Are these universities to follow the experience of many colleges and universities in the West and to be characterized in the future by a general indifference to religion? How can one calculate the resultant social upheaval? Is this not an opportunity to encourage development of mature religious thought and life? Widespread indifference would be a most unfortunate development in the East at a time when the indifference which was characteristic of a secular outlook in American education a decade or two ago has notably declined. Indeed this western development might prove illuminating to educators in other lands since the change is in the main a recognition of the high place of religion in the thought and experience of the founders of the Republic, as well as a fresh recognition of the importance for all who are engaged in the intellectual enterprise to study and teach religion objectively.

TOWARD A RESPONSIBLE UNIVERSITY

and fairly. Possibly there is no great need for apprehension or fear lest educators in Asia might neglect the claims of high religion since nationalism tends to focus attention upon the ancient cultures. It is to be hoped that Christian educators will have a share in this large cultural task, although some will doubtless have to overcome strong inhibitions. A thorough-going and responsible study of these fundamental problems might lead to the development of constructive programs which could go far to help preserve freedom for the growth of vigorous intellectual and religious life. Such a contribution is one that may be rightly expected of any university community in any land or time. Unfortunately, however, as is so well known in the West, the fundamental nature of these problems is easily thrown out of focus by the claims of competing religious groups and the urgent immediacies of educational administration are so exacting of time, energy and resources that other and long range matters may be neglected easily. These questions are not to be approached lightly for they deserve the most careful consideration by the most competent educators of the different countries. Analysis and solution of problems involved require mature scholarship and religious insight. Some Christian educators neglect this fundamental cultural problem for quite other reasons, but it would seem to offer to them an important opportunity in which they could perform a role as Christians and as educators and thus serve the wider interests of the cultures of which they are a part. Indeed, this might be to their own interests in the long run insofar as it helped to encourage an atmosphere of true intellectual and religious freedom. The experience of universities and colleges in other parts of the world might prove instructive, such for instance, as the experience of the public universities in the United States. But the solutions must be found in terms of each given cultural situation by those directly involved.

The discussions which culminated at the Bandung Conference have been continued in several of the countries represented and further extended by international and interregional visitation. Federation initiative in these matters has already proved a vital and creative influence in many places. In the light of their relevance and potential significance not alone for the Christian teacher and the Christian college, but for the peoples and cultures of the countries of Asia, it is to be hoped that their potentialities can be developed further. This is an important opportunity to help to provide more adequate opportunities for continuing exchange of thought among educators of various lands. It is also important that these discussions become more widely known in the West as one means of better understanding both of the peoples and of the universities of Asia.

Christian Scholarship and Christian Hope

A. ROY ECKARDT



THE SCHOLAR WHO SEEKS to serve objective truth and yet regards his work as a vehicle of Christian witness may in this generation find genuine cause for discouragement.

What Christian teacher has not been haunted on more than one occasion by the question of whether he is really accomplishing anything in his work? This is, of course, a perennial question. But it is most poignant today. Are we not reminded that this is the "post-Christian era?" Time and again the Christian scholar "homeward plods his weary way" after another day of battle with the evidently victorious heirs of Francis Bacon and Auguste Comte.

The adversary may not be inherently more shrewd than the Christian. But he has most of the equipment and most of the men—and tremendous zeal. Of primary significance, the climate is predominantly in his favor. The Gospel falls on alien ears in this day and age. Reinhold Niebuhr has remarked that the most pathetic thing in the world is an answer to a question which no one has asked. On the surface, men do not appear to need other glad tidings when, ostensibly, Science has provided not simply good news but the best news—best because it elevates man to a point of supremacy.

We live in a world in which, under the spiritual guidance of figures like John Dewey and Albert Einstein, the secrets of the universe are manipulated by white-robed priests within those modern shrines, the scientific laboratories. Will such a world have any traffic with a live Christian alternative?

In asking this question we have no intention of reviving the religion-science controversy in its traditional form of "Genesis versus Darwin." We are thinking of what might be called a basic *conflict of commitments*. What is the prospect for, and the function of, *Christian* scholarship in an intellectual world united by the commitment that self-sufficient man can solve his problems through being as "scientific" and "reasonable" as possible—or at least that his problems will either be settled in one or both of these ways or simply remain unsettled for lack of any other potent "technique." In alternate phrasing we may ask, What is the relation between Christian scholarship and Christian hope?

Naturally, the Christian, as a conscientious scholar, will present divergent views as objectively and fairly as possible. Nevertheless, where occasion warrants he will express through the oral and written word his Christian convictions as one who is committed to the *abiding truth* of the Christian position. It is to this aspect of the Christian's scholarly activity that we here apply the terms *Christian thought*

This is one of two papers, presented in this issue, preparatory to the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches, Evanston, Illinois, August 15-31, 1954. Dr. Eckardt is head of the Department of Religion of Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania; he is a frequent contributor to journals and author of the book, *Christianity and the Children of Israel*.

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE

and *Christian scholarship*. With reference to the phrases just mentioned, we regard the descriptive adjective as more normative and crucial for the present context than the nouns. By "scholarship," taken alone, we mean the broad vocational activity of the Christian professor in the roles of teacher, author, lecturer, student adviser, etc.

II

The World Council of Churches has chosen the theme of Christian hope for its Second Assembly at Evanston this summer. It is fitting that we approach the problem raised above within the context of that theme.

Our own relevant theological conviction is twofold.

1. The Christian hope does not ultimately derive from this-worldly accomplishment. It derives from faith in God. The desire to serve God through serving our neighbor is the truly Christian motivation for our actions rather than the desire to "accomplish" things. Positive human achievement is a secondary factor and is at best a by-product.
2. However, future human history is never without hope and the possibility of improvement, for it stands under the creative and redeeming power of God, who, at least in part, uses men at once good and evil to further his purposes for human life. We hold this interpretation to be not inconsistent with the Biblical point of view.*

Let us apply this dual conviction to the question before us. Six propositions will serve to guide our deliberations.

1. There is little ground for holding that twentieth century culture as a whole, including the universities, will be greatly influenced overtly by the current resurgence of Christian intellectual effort.
2. There are redeeming elements in, and consequences of, a man's work no matter when he may chance to live.
3. Christian faith gives meaning to life as a whole, including vocational pursuits.
4. The mills of ideas grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly well.
5. In scholarship as everywhere else, whoever seeks to save his life will lose it, and whoever loses his life will find it.
6. The love, grace and truth of God as revealed in Jesus Christ and apprehended in faith must, at last, be regarded as more decisive than the success of human intellectual endeavor.

III

There appears slight chance that the collective effort of contemporary Christian thinkers will have a markedly discernible effect in transforming the *Weltanschauung* of the generation now living, or even the culture of the next one hundred years. Thus, a first essential is to grant as fact the situation described in the opening paragraphs of this article.

Those who are now shouting, "Humanism is finished," or, "Scientism is dead," display a hope born much too prematurely.** No one alive to contemporary cur-

* Cf. the writer's article, "Land of Promise and City of God," *Theology Today*, January, 1954, pp. 482-491.

**Membership in the American Humanist Association increased four hundred per cent in a recent three-year period.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

rents in literature, poetry, art, political science, or theology will sensibly deny that the outlook of "modern man" has received severe jolts. But let us not underestimate the health and vigor of a youth hardly reached maturity. Scientific humanism is a powerful, aggressive, dominating force. It is widespread not alone in its "explicit, articulate form" but even more so in its "inarticulate or tacit form."* Secularism (*practical atheism*) reigns supreme in American thought, as elsewhere, and, barring wholly unpredictable eventualities, it will continue to do so for years to come. The influence of more than three centuries of scientific and philosophic reflection (aided and abetted by a Christian liberalism which has provided needed "religious" concurrence through its interpretations of man, the world, and history) has already been tremendous but, if anything, it is still gathering strength. Talk to most professors in psychology, philosophy, sociology, the sciences, etc., and see how much scientific humanism is in retreat! The philosophic outlook of most scientific humanists known to the writer has not been remotely influenced by the Christian intellectual renaissance which—be it noted—now extends back over more than thirty years.

God is sovereign Lord of history. Yet man as a creature made in the divine image is free to enthrone himself as center of the universe. Human sin effectively invades mind as well as heart. In the long run human effrontery is doomed. But the process of decay may take centuries. The thoughts men think, whatever their verisimilitude and moral worth, live long after their proponents are gone.

Were such contemporary scholarship as is motivated by Christian principles to expect an imminent rebirth of a Christian culture, its hope would be vain. There is little ground for imagining that men now living or their sons or grandsons will be around to witness the establishment of a Christian society grounded in Christian intellectual and theological assertion.

IV

Does this mean that no immediate motivation is forthcoming to undergird the efforts of the Christian professor? Yes, if the sole rationale for scholarship is present power to achieve world-shaking results. No, if justification of our work can be found in more personal and less tangible realms.

In *Age and Youth*, the renowned political scientist, Sir Ernest Barker, tells of a visit from T. E. Lawrence who ten years before had listened to Barker's history lectures at Oxford. Lawrence had just been fighting his way with the Arabs in the country of the Crusades. He remarked, "I used the tactics of Saladin; the History School came in handy." Barker adds the comment, "You never know what your pupils will do with the knowledge they acquire in their undergraduate days."**

In like manner, the boy or girl on the aisle in the fourth row of one of our

* Hutchinson, J. A. and Martin, J. A., Jr., *Ways of Faith*, Ronald Press, 1953, p. 446.

**Sir Ernest Barker, *Age and Youth*, Oxford University Press, 1953, p. 61.

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE

classes just may be prompted to set out on a course away from idolatry by a simple professorial remark made almost in passing. Many of us remember unforgettable phrases uttered by teachers whom we respected. We may apply our studies in less spectacular fashion than T. E. Lawrence is reputed to have done, but knowledge does insinuate itself into the warp and woof of our lives.

Of greater significance is the fact that the demeanor and attitude of the one behind the lectern influence students in profound and subtle ways. Awareness that we serve to turn youthful minds and hearts in this direction or in that makes plain a frightening responsibility. But this awareness tells us that teaching is never quite hopeless, for there are always *persons* before us affected qualitatively by what transpires within their educational experience. And there is an immediate reward in the realization that in thirty or thirty-five years of teaching we may have helped even one young person to see the truth of Christian faith. Christianity is a philosophy of quality, not of quantity. If there is really joy in heaven over just one sinner who repents, we need not be disconsolate regarding the significance of our efforts.

Deep down underneath, a spiritual hunger afflicts the most secularized student. A hidden despair harasses those who for redemption look to themselves and to the false deities of the world. Sören Kierkegaard observed that "one form of despair is precisely this of not being in despair, that is, not being aware of it." The heart of every man will continue to be restless until it finds its rest in the real God.

One's vocation can foster and reflect certain abiding values in any age. In full awareness of the danger of a martyr complex, we may yet point to a sublimity not to be destroyed of standing in the company of a faithful remnant for the truth of God as we see it, against powerful but pitiful idols constructed by the human mind. We may enjoy the very wrestle with a seeming chaos of truths, an encounter which points beyond itself to the Creator's confrontation numberless ages ago of an earth "without form and void." We may experience the measure of peace which comes to a man out of the awareness that he has done his job and has sought to do it well. And we may thank God for gifts of mind which foster a wide-eyed appreciation of what has been described as the "mysterious, messy, marvelous business" of life.

V

In similar vein, we may rest content in the knowledge that in ways beyond our comprehension all human effort, though continually judged and found wanting, at last receives fulfillment within the concealed plan of God. This knowledge is grounded in a faith which gives meaning to all of life.

In many discussions among Christian faculty members the question is raised sooner or later, How can the Christian mathematician, for example, be a witness to his Christian faith within the confines of instruction? There is often a strained silence. The answer is seldom forthcoming that such an individual makes his wit-

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

ness, *as a professor*, by being a good mathematician and a good teacher! Many of us have lost sight of the Christian doctrine of vocation taught by Paul and affirmed with vigor by Luther. This doctrine expresses the conviction that God calls most men to serve him *primarily* through their daily work.

How do I serve God? According to the New Testament I serve him through serving my neighbor. But who is my neighbor? He is the sophomore who needs friendly guidance for a better comprehension of his assignments. He is the colleague in the office down the hall who needs advice on a research project which has taken him over into my field. He is president of a student organization who needs suggestions for a more effective educational program. He is the student or teacher in a university abroad who needs information about the American Revolution and who turns to an American periodical or book for help. My neighbor is atheist, deist, Hindu, Jew, Catholic, Protestant or skeptic.

To the extent that we feel the need of our neighbor, meaning is implanted in our professional work. However, a moment's reflection will indicate the necessity of a more profound interpretation. Any and all the persons noted above may simply use the aid given them to further their will-to-power rather than to serve their own neighbors. I know this not only because I have seen it happen but because I have done it myself! The best of advice may issue in evil consequences. The greatest teaching may be directed to inhuman ends. We can never be sure of the end result of vocational—or other—effort. To "serve one's neighbor" is not necessarily to further the "right" or the "good." This is where the provisional meanings which life may have stand in need of an ultimate meaning if they are not to end in meaninglessness.

Irrationality and cynicism lie behind many repetitions of Tennyson's refrain,

Theirs not to reason why
Theirs but to do and die.

Yet there is a Christian note in these lines. In the last analysis, we do our job as men who, quite literally, do not know what we are doing. But we need not stop there. We do the best we can as Christians and then leave the final outcome to history and to God. Faith tells us that the very effort which comes to lack *apparent* sense is used of God in a way that, while exceeding our comprehension, does embody real meaning. This is where the issue is ultimately joined between Christian hope and human despair.

Men who have known "the power of Christ's resurrection" are granted a hope and a joy which by contrast make sad the heartiest laughter of their atheist associates. Atheism cannot overcome hopelessness, for its central affirmation is that there is no meaning to transcend and undergird the evident meaninglessness that pervades human life as a whole. Are we Christians deluding ourselves by our faith? Perhaps. But as the man in the New Testament story who had been born blind came to know one thing among many unknown things: "Now I see," so we know the meaningfulness that Christ gives to our lives and to our work. Respect-

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE

fully and in all humility, we invite others to a faith which dispels the blindness induced by despair.

VI

Thus far we have spoken of factors largely independent of such influence as Christian scholarship may exert upon culture. We shall return later to this independent area.

At the outset we granted insuperable obstacles to an immediate Christian transformation of culture by intellectual means. The picture changes when we look beyond the present to the horizons of the future. If we failed to include an additional consideration, we should be omitting a significant truth. Generally speaking, ideas have long-run consequences of great practical import for human life. Specifically, Christian thought has had and can have very great effect upon civilization.

Because we have faith in the power of God, we believe that the conversion of society in the direction of increased obedience to his will is never an impossibility. And it is a fact that the leadership which stems from human thought is a crucial factor in the birth, growth, and preservation of civilizations.

There is a measure of imperialism in any attempt to speak to generations yet unborn. However, much depends on the moral and spiritual quality of the point of view one seeks to foster. We Christians are responsible men, obligated to others of the future as well as of the present, committed to the truth of the Gospel, and well aware that people now dead invariably influence the lives and ways of descendants separated from them by long years. To the extent that scholarship conditions the future, the inevitable choice each of us faces is either to contribute by default to the continued hegemony of secular-humanist philosophies or to do all in our power to preserve and foster the Christian philosophy as a constant critic and positive guide of social morality.

The knowledge that one's intellectual endeavors *may* have a real practical effect upon the future amplifies the meaning in present scholarly efforts and thus further relates Christian scholarship and Christian hope.

Our fourth proposition can be illustrated through additional reference to the scientific-humanist outlook. One casual factor in the rise of modern culture has been the influence of the natural science period in philosophy which reached an apex in the seventeenth century but which has continued with gathering force into the present century. Francis Bacon's denunciation of the Idols of the Tribe, the Cave, the Market Place, and the Theatre was a direct, if unplanned, attack upon the structure of medieval society. Bacon substituted for these Idols a thorough-going inductive empiricism.

It is impossible to exaggerate the far-reaching effect that this empiricism of Bacon and of those of like mind has had upon the way of life of later generations. Bacon contributed to the ultimate triumph of naturalism, but he was of equal

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

importance in laying the foundation for humanist idealism. As E. E. Aubrey has said, the Renaissance enthusiasm for man reached its fruition in eighteenth-century rationalism, yet it was Bacon's *New Atlantis*, published in 1624, that provided the impetus.*

It is important to remember that the mills of these ideas ground slowly. More than two and a half centuries passed before the Baconian spirit fully blossomed into modern technology, secularism, and humanism.

Ideas do have telling consequences. Heine's description of Immanuel

Kant is classic. Kant lived an abstract, mechanical, old-bachelor existence, in a quiet, remote street in Königsberg. . . . Strange contrast between the outward life of the man and his world-destroying thought. Of a truth, if the citizens of Königsberg had had any inkling of the meaning of that thought they would have shuddered before him as before an executioner. But the good people saw in him but a professor of philosophy; and when he passed at the appointed hour they gave him friendly greetings—and set their watches.*

Kant, of course, destroyed many things. One long-range effect lay in the tendency to reduce religion to morality. The idealism of the obscure philosopher of Königsberg, propagated by the Ritschlian school of theology, was to be heard from hundreds and hundreds of Protestant pulpits in far-off America during the first half of the twentieth century.

If our thesis is valid and if these illustrations are pertinent, there is considerable hope that the powerful contemporary renaissance in Christian thought will help to form the world of those who live, let us say, two hundred years from now.

It takes quite a time for ideas to filter down and permeate a culture, particularly where that culture is held in the grip of powerful convictions of an opposing character. But there are already signs within Western culture itself that the tables may one day be turned.**

We do not advocate a rebirth of medievalism. The pre-scientific Christian authoritarianism of the Middle Ages, with all its glory and all its evil, is gone forever and it is fruitless to plead for its return.

A qualification is immediately necessary if the truth in our fourth proposition is not to suffer from undue exaggeration. Cultures do not transform themselves

* E. E. Aubrey, *Present Theological Tendencies*, Harper, 1936, p. 39.

* Quoted in A. K. Rogers, *A Student's History of Philosophy*, Macmillan, Third Edition, 1932, pp. 376-377.

** For example, some Christian thinkers are at the present time dealing weighty philosophical blows to the "scientific" theory of knowledge. In a brilliant analysis, Allan D. Galloway relies upon wholly philosophic argument to show the inherent falsehood of the "empirical" understanding of truth. Galloway refers to the epistemological contradiction in Hegel's affirmation that an object is known only in so far as it belongs to consciousness. But an object, as object, does not belong to consciousness. It is held in contrast to consciousness as that of which one is conscious. Hegel was driven by this contradiction into what he himself called "unhappy consciousness." Yet his nonsense is "significant nonsense" for it reveals how the philosophy of empirical science cannot show objectively the relation of knower to known, and cannot provide meaningful justification of its own epistemological procedure. Galloway then goes on to show how "self" and "world" are correlates and are both redeemed through Christ. (*The Cosmic Christ*, Harper, 1951.)

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE

merely by "taking thought" or by the influence of the thought of other men upon them. The contribution of pure thought is limited by a total framework of life which includes many non-intellectual factors. A given social matrix is created by the sum total of historical, spiritual, linguistic, artistic, moral, political, economic, and philosophic elements. None is omnipotent.

Intellectual endeavor is, nevertheless, of significance within the total pattern. A society cannot long survive where *doing* is not supported by *thinking*. If any single element is excluded from the pattern, the culture is not the same. The new outlook a culture may assume must contain a philosophic rationale if it is to continue to claim allegiance.

In his role of scholar, the Christian is directly concerned with the thought that contributes to the life of cultures. We should count it a privilege to live amidst, and to be part of, the growing Christian renaissance of thought. Let us exert all possible effort to bear a fair share of the intellectual burden through the broad transmissive responsibilities of Christian scholarship.

VII

But can a long-run transformation of culture be effected by Christian scholars who set out with that as their fixative purpose? Hardly. Limiting factors such as the influence of non-Christian philosophies aside, the answer must remain negative. Jesus' paradox of the gain and loss of life is as applicable to scholarship as to other areas of human existence. "Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall preserve it" (Luke 17:33). Hence, a fundamental reservation must be added to our reasoning in the section just concluded.

We must, of course, seek to provide modern secular man with a challenging way out of the blind alleys into which human reason always leads. Arnold Nash is quite right that "Christianity conquered the Graeco-Roman world because in addition to out-living and out-dying, the pagans it out-thought them."* Yet we do well to remember that those who made the conquest possible were, for the most part, men with eyes fixed upon the eternal rather than the temporal, men whose activity was one of contemplation rather than manipulation.**

Illustrations of our fifth proposition are forthcoming from secular life itself. In the words of H. Richard Niebuhr,

Plato discerned, Bentham assumed, and Roger Williams illustrated the truth that government can succeed only when governors are not too much concerned with their own temporal goods and when they do not stake too much on the success of government. . . . (Science itself) depends on the development of mathematical systems quite apart from the world, apart, that is to say, from interests in the solution of scientific problems. . . . New ideas are not developed in the confusion and immediacy of secular conflict. They are found by those who do not seek them, or do not seek them for the sake of the secular problem. They are found in the contemplation of another world and in

* Arnold Nash, "The Totalitarian University and Christian Higher Education," *Theology Today*, Oct. 1949, pp. 343-344.

** H. Richard Niebuhr, "Towards a New Other-Worldliness," *Theology Today*, April 1944, p. 80.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

the view of this one *sub specie aeternitatis*.†
So it is in religion.

All the goods of the world may be added to those who seek the kingdom of God and its righteousness but none of them seem to be available to us so long as we seek the kingdom for the sake of having these goods.*

And so it is in the quest for truth. The words "kingdom of truth" can be appropriately substituted for "kingdom of God" in the sentence last-quoted. Truth is a strange will-o'-the-wisp which eludes us when we seek to clasp it to our breasts for our own use. Only when truth is free does it turn to seek us out and take us in its own strong embrace.

The confrontation of truth is so often a by-product rather than a direct result of one's reflections. To seek deliberately to erect a monumental bridge of learning may be to end with a house of sand which washes away when the tide of life comes in. But to labor between despair of self and hope in God, half in doubt and half in prayer, not always sure of what one is about, is to see the way opened for unlooked-for results, transcending any conscious plan.

Elton Trueblood has alluded to the oft-noted hedonistic paradox, which tells us that to get happiness one must forget it. "It is not the happy but the deeply sad who are preoccupied with the problem of happiness."** There is also a *gnostic paradox*, which tells us that to reach truth one must forget it. It is not the scholarly who are preoccupied with the problem of scholarship.

VIII

Just as our fifth proposition is a counterpoise of the fourth, so a final consideration must restrain every this-worldly hope for scholarship, including the very hope which arises from confrontation with the truth that comes to us in self-forgetfulness. Christian commitment is not a handmaiden in the search of "truth for truth's sake," any more than Christian truth is a mere instrument for cultural change. Membership in the Kingdom of God is the pearl of great price in exchange for which all must be sold, including one's scholarly tomes. This fact does not deprive intellectual efforts of significance. On the contrary, it gives them Christian meaning by placing them in proper perspective.

We affirmed at the beginning that there is little hope of the imminent creation of a Christian society. This judgment may, indeed, turn out to be applicable to the entire course of future human history. Meaning is added to the work of the Christian scholar through the expectation that something of his effort will contribute to the well-being of future generations (although his work is meaningful apart from this assurance.) Yet no guarantee is forthcoming that we will ever have a society grounded in Christian truth.

As a matter of fact, an explicitly Christian social structure would not be the greatest blessing. It would contain its own evils. Christians are not Christ. Human

† Ibid. pp. 83, 84.

* Ibid. p. 86.

** Elton Trueblood, *The Life We Prise*, Harper, 1951, pp. 45, 39.

CHRISTIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND CHRISTIAN HOPE

sin can effectively permeate any society, including the society of the Church. As Christians, our final allegiance is to the God who judges all societies rather than to a particular culture. We can with justification make relative moral evaluations of differing cultures. But, with the New Testament as our norm, we must realize that the most Christian culture is always judged and found unloving and unjust by the God of absolute love and absolute justice.

It is this fact which precludes anxious alarm over the current predominance of secularism. God works in mysterious ways to reconcile men with men and humankind with himself. The very prevalence of secular humanism today may be a divine instrument to further service of neighbor, as well as a divine judgment upon a Church which has so often failed to be humane.

A necessary part of the Christian witness is a criticism of Christianity. Paul Tillich asks,

How can the Protestant church incorporate within itself the protest against itself? How can it be the bearer of grace without identifying itself with grace? . . . The Protestant protest against itself must become concrete, and it has, in fact, become concrete in its history: it is concrete in the very existence of a secular world. In so far as secularism is an offspring of Protestantism and is related to it in cooperation or enmity, we may call it "Protestant secularism." . . . Protestantism, by its very nature, demands a secular reality. It demands a concrete protest against the sacred sphere and against ecclesiastical pride. . . . If Protestantism surrenders to secularism it ceases to be a *Gestalt* of grace. If it retires from secularism, it ceases to be Protestant, namely a *Gestalt* that includes within it the protest against itself.*

God can even use anti-Christian philosophies to accomplish his purposes, as he once used the pagan Assyrians and Babylonians to chasten his own people.

This brings us to say a word concerning the place of a sense of humor in Christian scholarship. The presence of some men who adhere to Christian faith must induce greater psychological upset in the consistent atheist than the presence of atheists induces in the devoted Christian. To the atheist, Christianity is an illusion; to the Christian, atheism may be providential.

The Christian scholar must be as conscientious as the atheist scholar. Yet the Christian finds it easier to shrug his shoulders and even to laugh at his own attempts to move intellectual mountains. He knows that *sub specie aeternitatis* the greatest human achievements are by contrast rather ridiculous. Sören Kierkegaard was quite right in placing humor next in order to faith in the hierarchy of Christian virtues. For what is humor but an insight into one's real condition?

The Christian perspective at its best affords a *responsible nonchalance* about life which avoids the despair that forever stalks the now-or-never atheist, however much he may outwardly laugh at himself. Because life has meaning, the Christian will *act*. But because the center of his life is God and not man, he need not act desperately. The end of despair is inaction.

In recounting his own early spiritual-intellectual development, Paul Tillich speaks of the influence of Martin Kaehler upon generations of humanistically

* Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era*, University of Chicago Press, 1948, pp. 213-214. (Italics A.R.E.)

educated students.

The step I myself made in these years was the insight that the principle of justification through faith refers not only to the religious-ethical but also to the religious-intellectual life. Not only he who is in sin but also he who is in doubt is justified through faith. The situation of doubt, even of doubt about God, need not separate us from God. There is faith in every serious doubt, namely, the faith in the truth as such, even if the only truth we can express is our lack of truth. . . . You cannot reach God by the work of right thinking. . . . You cannot, and you are not even asked to try it. Neither works of piety nor works of morality nor works of the intellect establish unity with God. They follow from this unity, but they do not make it. They even prevent it if you try to reach it through them. But just as you are justified as a *sinner* (though unjust, you are just), so in the status of *doubt* you are in the status of truth.*

This is a word which has the power, we believe, to bring joy into the lives of many who are cast down. *However fervent their disavowals, all men secretly yearn for the forgiveness no other human being can ever give them. It may well be that the principle of justification by faith as applied to the intellect can establish the most meaningful contact between Christian evangelism and the secular mind in the university of today.*

I Corinthians 13 is a most appropriate summary text for our concluding proposition. The apostle Paul contrasts the transitoriness of human knowledge and the eternalness of divine love (*agape*). "Love never ends; as for prophecy, it will pass away; as for tongues, they will cease; as for knowledge, it will pass away . . . Now I know in part; then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood" (vss. 8, 12). It is good to remind ourselves that it is not we who finally build the Kingdom of Truth. Kierkegaard once pointed to the consolation that comes from being aware that before God all of us are in the wrong. We have spoken of the significance of ideas for a long-run determination of cultural patterns. But God remains sovereign over ideas. The laughter and crying of children may have greater import for life than the voices of sophisticated sages. In the Cross God makes foolish the wisdom of this world. To put our final hope in the fruits of scholarship is to be gnostics who vainly trust in the works of their own minds.

Having known the love of God in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, we are assured that the final outcome of human history will prove to be just and good. The tongues of men will cease and the books of scholars will close. All things are at last judged by God and fulfilled through His grace. Faith, hope and love abide. But the greatest of these is love. Love never ends. For love is God. And God is love. "Hope thou in God." (Psalm 42:5).

* Paul Tillich, *op. cit.*, pp. xiv, xv.

Christian Higher Education and the Christian Hope

EDGAR M. CARLSON



T WAS IN JULY, 1950 that the Central Committee of the World Council met in Toronto, Canada, and gave preliminary consideration to the theme for the Second Assembly. In a statement on the matter, which took note of the unpleasant realities confronting men both as Christians and as citizens, and recognized the discouragement of many and the false hopes of others, they concluded: "We think, therefore, that the main theme of the Assembly should be along the lines of the affirmation that *Jesus Christ as Lord is the only hope of both the Church and the world.*"

In the four years that have passed since then, the Christian Church has become involved in one of the most lively, disturbing, and productive discussions which it has witnessed for many years—perhaps for centuries. It is not likely that the Central Committee anticipated either the intensity or the direction of this discussion. There is little indication in the original statement that the Committee was consciously plunging the World Council into a full-scale discussion of eschatology.

Nonetheless this is what has happened. That it has happened is undoubtedly largely due to the work of the Advisory Commission on Theme for the Evanston Assembly, originally known as "the Commission of Twenty-five." This group was brought together on the assumption that they were influential Christian thinkers, broadly representative of the various countries, Communions, and schools of theological outlook within the constituency of the World Council. Its members were called "to wrestle together with the most fundamental and central issue of the Christian faith." They were specifically assigned the task of producing a statement on the meaning of the Christian hope in the situation in which the churches now find themselves.

The Commission held three sessions of approximately ten days each in the summers of 1951, 1952, and 1953. As one who was privileged to serve on this Commission, the writer has been permitted, or compelled, to face rather personally and directly the shock and the challenge which a Biblical eschatology offers to American Protestant theology. As one involved in a program of Christian Higher Education, he has not been able to avoid the implications of this kind of confrontation for the whole program of higher education as this is carried on by the Church. It may be helpful to others to put on record some of the impressions that have come.

Dr. Edgar M. Carlson is the President of Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

TENSIONS OVER ESCHATOLOGY

There were seven Americans in the group that gathered at Rolle, Switzerland, in July 1951. It is doubtful that any one of them expected that the matter of primary importance would be the subject of eschatology,—certainly no one anticipated that differences of opinion regarding the meaning of the Second Coming of Christ would constitute an all but insurmountable obstacle to any common proclamation on the Christian hope. Yet, this is what happened. For four days the Commission was quite literally stalled by lack of agreement, or even of understanding, with reference to this issue. For many members of the Commission it was a strange new world, and one which lacked reality. American theology in general, and liberal theology in particular, had deleted the doctrine of the Second Coming from its working theology or had spiritualized it to a degree where it was no longer troublesome.

But there were European Christians for whom the doctrine had come to have new relevance as they had followed the Crucified One into the "fellowship of his suffering." It was an unforgettable morning when Professor Schlink of Heidelberg University led in devotions, using portions of Matthew 24 and I Cor. 13 as a basis for his meditation. He explained how precisely the apocalyptic passages had brought hope and strength to the persecuted Church under the Third Reich; how the light that came from these passages had illuminated the whole of the Gospel for them; and how this was still happening in the persecuted churches of the East. It was from these sections of the Gospel, he said, that they had come to understand that the Church must never be at home in the world and had drawn power to resist tyranny. After that meditation it seemed that the deadlock was broken. We understood that we were not arguing about the relative merits of two theological interpretations but that we were dealing with the richness of the Gospel and hearing testimonies of the blessings which had come to fellow-Christians out of parts of that Gospel which we had largely neglected.

The report which was finally hammered out of the ten days at Rolle bore the imprint of the controversy that had taken place and constituted an acknowledgment that the Christian Church could not speak of Christian hope without confronting the ultimate hope,—which is bound up with the end of history and the return of Christ. An attempt was also made to give due recognition to the lesser hopes of men which can find fulfillment within history. There is no denying, however, that it was the hope beyond history which occupied the center of attention and that the earthly hopes of men had not been integrally related to it.

The reaction of the churches in America to that first report varied from mild agreement to almost angry rejection. Nonetheless, in America as elsewhere, the report had to be studied, if only to be denounced and refuted. From every country came reports prepared by individuals, commissions, and conferences. Most of them were critical, but most of them also acknowledged that an issue had been raised

CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CHRISTIAN HOPE

which could not be ignored.

The report of the second session held in September, 1952, gave evidence of much greater unity both in content and presentation. It was, on the whole, much more favorably received. This was in part due to the fact that it had succeeded in relating the ultimate hope and the lesser hopes more integrally than had previously been done. It offered a logic for a socially aggressive eschatological emphasis. While the social emphasis is even more definitely asserted in the final report to be submitted to the Evanston Assembly, the logic used in the second report has been discarded.

The second report received even more intensive study than had the first. Study commissions were set up in many countries including some behind the Iron Curtain. In Hungary, for instance, the document was very thoroughly studied. It is almost certainly true that no issue has been the subject of such widespread simultaneous study and discussion within theological circles in modern times as has the issue of eschatology.

The first two reports were study documents and may be judged to have been eminently successful in achieving the purpose for which they were designed. The final statement, which is to be released to the delegates to Evanston, is a document of somewhat different character. It will provide the basis for the first week's discussion when the Assembly convenes. If approved, it will constitute a proclamation of the Church, as represented in the World Council, concerning the meaning of the Christian hope and its implications for our world and time. It would be premature and somewhat presumptuous to discuss in any detail the content of this statement, though it is quite obvious that while it is not just a revision of previous statements, it is the fruition of all the discussion which these statements have produced. It may also be assumed that any statement on the message of the Church today which is the product of this kind of ecumenical discussion and which has so conspicuous a sounding board as the Second Assembly of the World Council of Churches will merit and receive considerable attention around the world.

ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

What is the significance of this for Christian Higher Education? The Christian teacher, and in particular the teacher of Bible, is a key person in the Church as well as in education. If the discussion that has taken place and will take place has no relevance for him, it is not likely that it has relevance for anyone else. But does this actually have relevance for him as a teacher, over and beyond that which it has for him as a Christian? Here are a few observations that seem pertinent to that question.

1. Already something has happened in the intellectual climate of the Christian Church, as a result of the discussion which has taken place, which cannot be ignored by anyone who presumes to represent the thought of the Church some-

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

where along the frontier of intellectual inquiry. Purely as a theological phenomenon the debate over the eschatological implications of the Christian hope must be required reading for anyone who expounds the Christian faith at the level of higher education.

2. The assertion that eschatology is not only an inherent and intrinsic element in the Christian message but that it is also part and parcel of the whole perspective within which the Christian message is to be understood and the Christian commitment is to be defined, constitutes a definite challenge to most classroom teachers of Bible in Protestant colleges in America. Courses in Bible have tended to become objective—and thereby achieve academic stature—by concentrating on historical data and moral teaching. In both areas, the eschatological passages of the New Testament have been somewhat of an embarrassment, either to be ignored or to be explained away. We have been educating people away from a "primitive" Christian view oriented toward the future and have concentrated attention on the historical revelation and the contemporary obligation. If the churches of the World Council are prepared to affirm the positive eschatological emphasis which is contained in the Statement of the Advisory Commission, the teacher of Bible in our Christian colleges may be called upon to reappraise an interpretation of the Bible which leaves out any meaningful reference to eschatology.

3. It would be well if we should be driven to renewed and revitalized study of the Bible. After a rather intense session at Rolle, one of the members of the Commission commented, concerning certain arguments that had been advanced by another: "You speak as though the New Testament had never been written." Perhaps that is saying too much, but have we not often found the New Testament useful to the degree that it provided sanctions for ideas and attitudes which we find congenial and which are generally acceptable to the spirit of our times? What do we really mean by Biblical authority? We have too often contented ourselves with discussions of the problem at a level where only the techniques and results of higher criticism seemed important.

4. In at least two areas where American Protestantism has sought to defend itself against the passivity of the eschatological outlook, a genuine Biblical eschatology provides a more adequate and dynamic basis for faith and action than does a view of Christianity which ignores or rejects eschatology. We have been concerned to stress the work of God in history and the relevance of Christian faith for the historical task, as over against the other-worldliness of eschatology which emphasizes God's action beyond history. And we have been concerned about the social character of the Christian commitment and assignment, as over against the individualism which usually accompanies an other-worldly emphasis.

With respect to the matter of history, perhaps the two alternatives could be put in this way: American Protestantism has asserted that Jesus Christ is Lord in history; Biblical eschatology asserts that Jesus Christ is Lord *of* history. The former is not a larger, nobler, and more dynamic idea than the latter. It is not only

CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE CHRISTIAN HOPE

a matter of Christ's Lordship over certain people, or movements, or events, but over the totality of people, movements, and events. As soon as one speaks in these terms he begins to speak the language of eschatology.

Are we quite sure that we have been entirely consistent in our emphasis upon the social character of the Christian faith? Have we not contented ourselves with a very individualistic interpretation of eternal life? Individual survival or fulfillment is no adequately consequence of a genuinely social concern in history. Or, to reverse the thought, if the ultimate outcome of life is best defined in terms of personal fulfillment, there is no adequate ground for asserting that one must find his historical fulfillment in corporate and even cosmic well-being. The Christian assertion concerning corporate and cosmic fulfillment, which is inherent in the eschatological outlook, provides a more adequate basis for asserting the social character of our Christian commitment.

5. Those views of life which are most clearly rivals of Christianity today are definitely futuristic in their outlook. This is most obviously true of Marxism. Its eschatology is this-worldly, to be sure, but it is eschatology nonetheless. The past has only a sort of second-rate reality about it. History can be rewritten if it serves the interest of the eschatological future. The mechanism of historical process moves toward a foreordained culmination, in which men may share but which they cannot prevent. It is the future prospect that fires the enthusiasm of emergent nationalism in the under-developed nations of the world, and it is the hope for a manageable future that sustains the honest devotees of scientific and democratic humanism in the developed nations of the world. Is a view of Christianity which is oriented towards the future, as early Christianity clearly was, irrelevant in a world which seems to be so receptive to the promise which the future holds? If it is as true that Christ is coming as it is that He came, it is perhaps also true that it is no less important.

It must of course be understood that the one is no substitute for the other. Christianity is clearly anchored in historical fact, and the meaning of Christ's life and death is not to be negated by any legitimate anticipation of His final triumph. On the contrary, it is not possible to give full emphasis to the more than historical meaning of His life and death without giving due recognition to the Christian hope concerning His final triumph.

The members of the Advisory Commission are keenly aware that they have not written the final statement on the Christian hope. They have composed no encyclical which can claim authority, either in and of itself or by virtue of their authorship. Their report constitutes an honest and an earnest effort to give expression to the full Christian Gospel as it confronts the fundamental issues of our time. It is also an invitation to continuing study and discussion on the meaning of the Christian hope. It is to be hoped that those who speak for the Church in the area of higher education will accept the invitation.

The Theology of Education

J. V. LANGMEAD CASSERLEY



THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION is quite distinct from any discussion of the most appropriate methods and techniques employed in religious education, as also from any quasi-philosophical, quasi-political consideration of the proper place of religious education in the educational system as a whole. A theology of education, as I understand it, means a theological interpretation of the educational process as such, leading to the definition of a point of view from which it is possible to analyze and criticize any particular educational system or technique.

Such a theology of education is only possible if we profess the kind of theology which is prepared to affirm some kind of doctrine of natural law, and is skilled in the use of what I might call "the natural law method of theological analysis." A theology which confines itself to the scrutiny and interpretation of a particular field of data—possibly the scriptures, the dogmatic formulae and history of the Catholic Church, or perhaps even what is called "religious experience"—might very well have some interesting and illuminating things to say about education, but it could not conceivably include the interpretation of the educational process as such within the scope of its interests.

Clearly this is not the place in which to argue the case for some kind of doctrine of natural law. I myself do accept a doctrine of natural law and shall therefore employ this concept in the discussion which follows. Nor can I expound and defend what I have called "the natural law method of theological analysis." Such a defense would necessitate delving deep into several other kindred theological themes. I feel that I must, however, briefly describe it, without any attempt at justifying it.

THE NATURAL LAW METHOD OF THEOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

When the natural law theologian, or theological sociologist, embarks upon the task of theologically interpreting some universal or quasi-universal social institution or process—such as the family, the state or education—he commences by an empirical enquiry into all the known forms and varieties of the phenomenon in question, with the object of arriving at some kind of norm or stereotype in terms of which he can interpret trends of development, patterns of change, and degrees of success or failure, within his field of empirical data. This normative stereotype is a kind of universal, but not the universal of the traditional, classifying, Aristotelian logic. Rather it is a kind of composite intellectual picture of what all the varieties

Dr. J. V. Langmead Casserley is Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the General Theological Seminary in New York City. Formerly teaching Sociology at the University of the Southwest in Exeter, he is the author of such well-known books as *The Christian in Philosophy* and *The Retreat from Christianity in the Modern World*; his most recent book is entitled *Graceful Reason*. This paper on "The Theology of Education" is the third in our current series on this general subject; like the earlier papers, it was presented at the "Week of Work" of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education last September at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION

are trying to become and, in a fallen world, always failing to become. (Nature from this point of view means not so much what we have been or what we are, as what we are capable of becoming and trying to become). Where we have a successful stereotype of this kind we shall be able to interpret relative success and stability in terms of the degree to which an institution conforms to its stereotype and achieves at least some of its characteristic values, relative instability, and ultimate failure. Clearly the success of an intellectual venture of this kind depends upon the extent of the available empirical knowledge, and I suppose it can never hope to be complete. Natural law doctrine in the past has been frustrated by its lack of empirical knowledge, but we ought not on that account to abandon the doctrine of natural law. Rather we should say the modern age, by amassing for the first time a vast store of empirical sociological and ethnological data, is one in which it is at last possible to use and apply natural law doctrine with some hope of success. The natural law doctrine of the classical Christian theologians, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, seems to me rationally valid but pragmatically sterile. In the providence of God, these frustrated conditions have happily passed away.*

THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

(a) *Its dialectical character.* Education is always distinct from mere growth. Inevitably it includes processes of nurture and nourishment, but education would be impossible without growth. Only beings who can grow can be educated. In other words, education is a kind of dialectical process in which the self and the not-self persistently interact with and enrich each other. It is primarily, although not exclusively, a social process in and through which the transition from bare abstract individuality to concrete personality takes place.**

This formula will enable us to mediate between over-traditionalist and over-modern schools of educational thought. Education is more than a mere process of individual growth in which the educator stands by hopefully to do what little he can to facilitate the process whenever his assistance may be helpful. On the other hand, the individual is more than a mere *tabula rasa* upon which education can write what it wills; from the standpoint of Christian theology the individual is not a *tabula rasa* but a somewhat chaotic collection of tendencies and potentialities. Of course, the individual is only an abstract concept. We never meet him in practice. If he exists at all it is only at the moment of birth, and probably not even then, for no doubt the educational process begins in the womb. Christian theology

* The same strictures would apply to the Lutheran doctrine of "the orders" in its received form. This is really a kind of natural law doctrine although not, in my view, a very satisfactory one, because it does not make it clear how and why, if there is a natural law and whether or not we can know it, the natural law is certainly the law of God.

** We may note that individualism and personalism are not the same thing. The crucial issue for contemporary existentialist philosophy arises at this point. It has to make up its mind whether it is really a kind of individualism, which thinks in terms of some kind of antithesis between the self and the not-self, in which the one can only be affirmed at the expense of the other, or some kind of personalism, which thinks in terms of a necessary and fruitful dialectic between the self and the not-self in which each is indispensable to the other.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

would also stress the incompleteness of the individual. His nature is not given him with his individuality. Rather it is achieved in the full flowering of his personality. We must beware of interpreting individuality and growth in terms of nature, and education and all the other processes which complete individuality and enable it to make its transition to personality in terms of nurture. This was the error of Rousseau, and all those thinkers who make a radical distinction between nature and civilization. Nurture is natural, and without nurture man cannot discover and fulfill his nature. Without the not-self which includes for us the cosmos, society and God—there is no self. Education in the widest sense of the word is thus an expanding and creative dialectic between the individual's capacity to grow and the responding capacity of nature, society and God—or, if we prefer it, of God through nature, society and grace—to nourish and complete the individual.

(b) *Its eschatological character.* If this is so, education is a process which cannot fulfill itself, and therefore cannot disclose its whole and final meaning within temporal limits. All time is not enough time for education, just as all time is not enough time for salvation. This is the basic contribution of biblical eschatology to all our thinking—the incompleteness and therefore partial meaninglessness of the temporal.

That education is an eschatological process is the theological and Christian way of saying definitively what non-religious humanists and liberals are trying to say when they talk about the 'openness' or 'open-mindedness' of education. Any concrete system of education is essentially the initiation of an individual into a culture. Even the most rudimentary initiation into even the simplest culture enables a man to transcend the boundaries of mere individuality and becomes a person in society. But even the most ambitious and diversified culture is itself incomplete, and initiation into it may do no more than overthrow one set of boundaries in order to erect others. An educational process which is aware of the incompleteness of the culture into which it initiates its sons and daughters must strive to remain open, and to avoid any narrow cultural provincialism which would do no more than substitute the limitations of a particular society for the limitations of bare uneducated individuality. Hence the validity of the plea for openness in education.

We may usefully distinguish, however, three distinct types or dimensions of openness.

(1) *Geographical openness.* By this term I refer to the openness of a culture, and hence of the educational system by which it transmits itself, to the influence of other cultures, its readiness to observe and appreciate and assimilate their characteristic values. Primarily I have in mind, of course, other contemporary cultures, but this kind of openness includes also a historical sense and a willingness to reverence and learn from what we know of past cultures.

(2) *Temporal openness.* By this term, I refer to the constant readiness to accept and assimilate new developments, indeed a proneness positively to expect them.

THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION

which is characteristic of any healthily growing culture and educational system. But the stress must be on the world *assimilate*. The progress and expansion of a culture is impossible if the new development destroys and supplants instead of enriching what was there before. The revolutionary interpretation of novelty, which has done so much to hinder the orderly growth and impede the progressive expansion of modern Western culture, is no doubt a by-product of, and a justified protest against, the conservative interpretation of, and way of defending, existing achievement. But the tension between the two has created a superfluous conflict which has bedevilled our culture and our thinking for the last two hundred years or so. A true openness will bring this conflict to an end by interpreting and valuing the past and the present precisely because they have created for us a point of view from which it is possible to look out with wide-eyed receptivity upon the future.

So far we shall probably have succeeded in keeping secular humanists and liberals more or less with us. But I want to go even further, for it seems to me that these two dimensions are insufficient of themselves. Mere geographical openness frequently produces no more than an eclectic or cosmopolitan attitude which lumps cultural values together in an indiscriminating 'broadminded' chaos. Mere temporal openness is a particularly difficult attitude to adopt because, after all, it is essentially openness to the unknown. In practice, the progressivist mind identifies it with undiscriminating enthusiasm for the more recently known, so that for a fruitful tension between the achievement of the past and the promise of the future he substitutes an actual social conflict between distinct elements in the contemporary cultural situation. Always the stress must be on assimilation and upon preserving unimpaired our capacity to assimilate. Real cultural development is impossible without assimilation. The dyspeptic who cannot control his appetite, who eats everything and digests nothing, is in a most grievous and unenviable condition.

But if our stress on the incompleteness inherent in the very nature of all temporal and finite cultural elements is justified, we shall see that the mere openness of one kind of incompleteness to permeation by another kind of incompleteness can never suffice our needs. We must look about us for a third kind of openness of a more fundamental character.

(3) *Metaphysical or spiritual openness*. It would seem that education cannot fulfill itself in the mere transmission of culture or in subservience to culture. Culture alone is not enough. By metaphysical or spiritual openness I mean the openness of all culture to that which transcends culture, the openness of all temporal culture and education which comes from a humble forswearing of the illusion of completeness either now or at any possible future time. This is the openness of the temporal to the eternal, the deliberate defenselessness of a culture against religious penetration. All education and culture either opens itself to religious and spiritual

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

influences or it encloses itself in ultimate boundaries which must in the last resort cancel out and nullify whatever degree of openmindedness it may achieve in the other two dimensions. To say that culture is ultimately not enough is by no means to adopt an anti-cultural attitude. Culture is valid and necessary and, by virtue of his possession of it, man is indeed the paragon of animals. But culture alone can never avail to secure that complete and final flowering of individuality into personality which every educational process by its very nature exists to achieve. The *end* of man in the classical sense of the word cannot be achieved without culture, but neither can it be achieved by culture alone. Modern usage has made the term *end* a somewhat ambiguous, non-eschatological one. In popular parlance *end* usually means the point in time at which we leave off rather than the eternity in which we culminate. I suppose that in the modern sense of the word some particular phase of secular culture and secular education is indeed the end of man. But education, if we understand correctly its inherent nature, is concerned with the end of man in the classical and eschatological sense of the word, a completing of man in which his nature is at last revealed in the fulfillment of all his potentialities and the realization of his destiny. Such a consummation may indeed be devoutly desired, but it cannot be fulfilled in terms of incomplete finite cultures, or within the mere flux of transitional phases and epochs.

THE CRITICISM OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The term 'educational institution' properly refers to much more than educational institutions in a specialized and narrower sense. In most societies, including our own, the primary and most important educational institution is neither the school nor the university but the family. It is here that the young recruit to society learns his native language, the indispensable medium of all subsequent education, and the basic associative and self-disciplinary techniques necessary for harmonious life in community. Nevertheless, in this discussion we shall confine our attention to educational institutions in the narrower and more specialized sense.

We have already noticed the treat to the dialectical balance of an educational system and technique presented either by an overfree system of education, usually called 'progressive education,' which lays too much emphasis upon the growth factor, or by an over-authoritarian educational system and technique, which lays too much emphasis on the nurture factor. At the present time, the cult of free educational techniques is much the greater menace of the two, but it was not always so, and indeed the excessive freedom of recent and contemporary education was originally and still is motivated and sustained by a not unjustifiable reaction against excessive authoritarianism. Nevertheless, the time has certainly come to seek for a more balanced, truly dialectical pattern of relationships between teacher and pupil in school and university. When we criticize authoritarianism, we do not mean that authority is inherently evil, but merely that it may be and often is,

THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION

abused by those who concentrate too narrowly and excessively upon its importance and necessity. Authoritarianism is not the essence but the corruption of authority. In the same way libertarianism is not the essence but the corruption of freedom. This is as true in the social life of the family, the school and the university as in the political life of the state. The essence of true democracy is to seek for a balanced and fruitful dialetic between the two in every sphere of our corporate existence. However, all this is fairly obvious, and we shall perhaps do better to concentrate on the contemporary forces which deny or ignore what we have called 'the eschatological' character of education. (1) The modern tendency for educational institution to be dominated by the nation state, or more subtly by "the national spirit", constitutes a threat to the geographical openness of education. (2) The tendency for the minds of educators to be overinfluenced by the intellectual spirit of the age, the *zeitgeist*, menaces the temporal openness of education. (3) The permeation of educational institutions by the spirit of secularism menaces its metaphysical or spiritual openness. In other words, the theological interpretation of education which I have so briefly sketched leads us to call in question the political basis, the intellectual temper and prevailing this-worldly spirit of contemporary education.

TWO TYPES OF ANTI-EDUCATION PROVINCIALISM

It is odd to notice how rarely in contemporary discussions of the respective merits of public control and private enterprise we get any recognition of the fact that inevitably any modern community contains and includes both of them. The real question is not which we shall have but, since we shall certainly have both of them, where precisely we shall have them. The most fervent advocate of private enterprise would not propose returning to the age of private armies and accepts a socialized army, a socialized navy and a socialized air force without question. Yet the German sociologist, Max Weber, quite rightly perceived the beginnings of modern socialism in the nationalization of the means of force at the close of the Middle Ages. Very recently I was talking to a friend who was violently critical of what he called "the socialized medicine" of contemporary Britain. At one stage in the discussion I said to him, "And what about your socialized education?" He stared at me in surprise. He was so used to the socialized education of the United States that I do not think he had ever before noticed that it was socialized.

My own belief is that wherever else we have or do not have private enterprise, we must, for education's sake, have private enterprise in education. Throughout the Western World, and increasingly elsewhere, the modern state, in a laudable desire to secure education for all, has embarked upon a policy of providing schools to which all can go. I believe that this has been a disaster for education. The better policy would have been to finance education without providing schools, although some inspection of them is in order to see that they maintain proper standards

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

of technical, academic efficiency and physical amenities. The trouble with the educational system dominated by the nation state is that it so easily becomes an instrument of local propaganda rather than a purely educational one. This is most obvious in the totalitarian states, of course, but signs of the same tendency can be found elsewhere. Thus for several generations American schools have had the task of welding into some kind of national unity a society recruited from many different parts of the globe and from many different cultures. In Great Britain the socialist reformers of education make no secret of their desire to use schools to foster social unity and create a one-class society, presumably imbued with a kind of upper working class or lower middle class spirit. I make no criticism of such purposes, but I would suggest that they are not educational purposes, and that they must deflect education from the pursuit of its own proper goal. It is perhaps an interesting paradox that the school system of capitalist America provides socialist educational thinkers in Great Britain with a picture of the ideal at which they are aiming, except, of course, that like some capitalist Americans, they would also propose to abolish all private schools. But the profounder objection to the state-dominated school is its inevitable provincialism, its nationalized versions of history, its emphasis upon the achievements and values of the local culture, its constant suggestion that the local culture has a kind of messianic significance and vocation. It is not through educational institutions such as these that the true geographical openness of education can be achieved and expressed. True education in the context of any culture must revere and value other cultures. This can be done, indeed, with a proper loyalty to the values of one's own culture, but not without drawing attention to its inevitable deficiencies and incompleteness.

In the same way an intellectual temper too narrowly dominated by the spirit of the age, by an excessive preoccupation with "modern thought," modern developments and so on, shuts us up in another kind of restrictive provincialism. It either ignores the past, as irrelevant to the present, or is critical of the past for not having been the present, or worst of all, patronizes the past as a mere course of development which leads up to the present. With the future it deals even more arrogantly,

for the future, as this type of mind interprets it, is the stage upon which the spirit of the present will achieve its supreme triumph, the realization of all its aims and the translation into actuality of all its implicit assumptions. The future, so to speak, will be like the present only more so. Thus the clue to the whole story is found in one passing phase of its development. We may call this the vulgarly modernist interpretation of history. It is a kind of caricature of the Christian interpretation of history, which also finds the clue to the meaning of all history in one particular historical episode, the Incarnation. But there is a world of difference between finding the significance of history in an act in history of the God who transcends history, and finding the significance of history in a passing intellectual mood of man who certainly does nothing of the kind. The one opinion may indeed be rationally

THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION

entertained, but the second could never be more than a blind and arbitrary act of self-opinionated faith. Certainly this vulgar modernist interpretation of history, as I have called it, is quite incompatible with, and must be ultimately destructive of, the temporal openness of true education.

A CRITIQUE OF SECULARISM

We have thus isolated and defined two distinct types of anti-educational provincialism. Where there is no geographical openness, education imprisons its children within the confines of the particular culture of the particular region. Where there is no temporal openness, it imprisons the mind in an arrogant and idolatrous spirit of the age. But where there is no metaphysical openness, the world itself is turned into a province. An education imbued by a pragmatic and utilitarian spirit, recognizing only contemporary issues and predicaments, and dismissing all else as irrelevant, transforms and corrupts the cosmos. For such an educational system the cosmos is no longer a home amply lighted by wide windows, but a dungeon overshadowed by towering and unclimbable walls. It is one of the greatest and most destructive of modern heresies that man is most likely to make a success of this world by ignoring the reality of any other. This is also a ridiculous heresy, for nothing can be properly understood or wisely used if we deliberately refuse to pay any attention to its context. It is this consideration which brings us to the point at which we can perceive the vital importance of religious education, not so much for the sake of religion as for the sake of education. There is no antidote to the poison of secularism in education apart from deliberate and conscious religious education. A school system may justify its ignoring of religious education by pleading that religious education will be given elsewhere and through other agencies. This may be true, and of course we hope it will be true, but however successful the other agencies may be, the school itself will be gravely injured by so terrible an abdication of responsibility. The secular school cannot function without implicitly conveying the suggestion that what it ignores is not essential to its purposes, whereas, as I have tried to show in the preceding analysis, what it ignores is in fact absolutely essential to its purposes.

Of course, we ought to say all this without blaming or criticizing any particular men or generations of men unjustly. There were and still are, solid reasons for the adoption of a secular school system in the United States and many other parts of the world. By far the most important of these is the fact of religious schism, which created an almost insoluble problem for educators in many parts of the world, and the blame for that must rest upon Christians and not upon educators. Nevertheless, the fact remains that any system of education which deliberately excludes religious education is an educational system *manque*, an educational system doomed to fall short of the highest and most essential purposes of education itself.

Clearly our criticism of contemporary educational systems, based on our

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

theology of education, turns out to be a sweeping and radical one. We must not be too surprised at that. In a fallen world the theological criticism of anything is bound to be radical and sweeping. After all, Christianity is essentially a revolutionary and redemptive quarrel with a fallen world—not the quarrel of the Christians with a fallen world, for they themselves belong to it and exemplify its shame, but the quarrel of God with the fallen Christians and through the fallen Christians with the fallen world. Because this quarrel with a fallen world is revolutionary it must be clear and cogent in its criticism and condemnation; because it is more than merely revolutionary but also redemptive, it must at the same time be radiant with patience and charity. Our little systems of secular revolution, of course, cannot understand this. They never rise from the revolutionary to the redemptive plane. They criticize without understanding and act without love. Their song is of judgment but never of mercy. But these after all are but the little systems of revolution which have their day and cease to be; they are but broken lights of the great prophetic revolution which speaks to us in and through the Word of God. It is with such convictions and in such a spirit that we must define and urge upon our contemporaries our theological criticism of existing educational institutions.

Comment on "The Theology of Education"

ROGER L. SHINN

Mr. Casserley's paper is rich enough that the request for a brief comment imposes a severe discipline upon me. This fact itself is evidence of my appreciation. But since disagreements are usually more interesting than agreements, I will mention two points at which I question the paper.

1. The "natural law of analysis" puzzles me. Although it is mentioned only in the introduction, I suspect that it is the source of some of the other problems I find in the paper.

Mr. Casserley suggests that by an empirical inquiry we can discover a norm of what an institution is "trying to become," and can thereby evaluate the success of the institution. I do not understand this. I am ready to grant that, in Aristotelian language, empirical analysis may show that an acorn is "trying to become" an oak tree rather than a corn stalk. But does this empirical method give comparable help in providing norms for evaluating social institutions?

Like Mr. Casserley I see great usefulness in the amassing of empirical data. But where do we go then? Presumably Mr. Kinsey has more data than anyone else about certain family patterns and sex habits in the U. S. A. But can he best

Roger L. Shinn is head of the Department of Philosophy at Heidelberg College, Tiffin, Ohio.

THE THEOLOGY OF EDUCATION

tell us what the family is "trying to become"? I would say instead that the data drive us to the point where, if we would find a "norm" or "stereotype" for the family, we must make a judgment that is irreducibly a value judgment or a confession of faith. The implications for education may be far different from the implications of a "natural law method."

2. It is helpful to get a criticism of some notions of public education which we often glorify without critical thought. Yet I must strenuously disagree in part.

The U. S. public school system is not, of course, entirely dominated by the nation state. Local school boards, sometimes for better and sometimes for worse, govern the schools. Nevertheless (or sometimes because of this fact) we do have the problems Mr. Casserley mentions. The actions of some school boards in outlawing UNESCO materials and the subservience of other boards to pressures from the American Legion and similar groups underscore the point.

But is Mr. Casserley's proposal a cure? Another critic with a British background, Arnold Nash, has accused the British non-governmental schools of inculcating the same sort of nationalistic religion which Mr. Casserley fears in the tax-supported schools. Perhaps the cultural ethos more than the specific organization of the schools determines their bent.

My own preference is for a pluralistic educational system. Grateful for my own public school education, I expect to send my children to the public schools. But I resent the occasional proposals to *force* parents to send their children to the schools established by the government. I know of one incident where a Negro education student was not permitted to do her required student teaching in the public schools. Her Protestant church college met the problem by finding an opportunity for her in the local Roman Catholic high school. I was glad that this town had both public and private schools.

Clearly no system will guarantee good education. My preference in the U. S. today is that the public schools be strong but not hold a monopoly on education.

Books and Publications

SOME PUBLICATIONS ON THE UNIVERSITY CONCERN

The publications which are referred to recurrently in almost every discussion of the purpose of higher education, the movements of professors, and the relation of faith to the areas of scholarship and teaching, at least among those who approach these concerns as Christians, are relatively few in number. There are, of course, more of these than the following list suggests; but these are certainly the introductory publications and lead to the reading of many others.

The Task of the Christian in the University. By A. John Coleman. Geneva: The World's Student Christian Federation, 1946.

Religious Perspectives in College Teaching. By Hoxie N. Fairchild, editor. New York: The Ronald Press, 1952. (The "Religious Perspectives" series of Hazen Pamphlets.)

The Crisis in the University. By Sir Walter Moberly. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

The University and the Modern World. By Arnold S. Nash. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1944.

University Pamphlets. By Ronald H. Preston, editor. London: The S.C.M. Press, 1946. (These include (1) "The Mind of the Modern University" by John Baillie; (2) "Objectivity and Impartiality" and (3) "The Christian in the Modern University" both by H. A. Hodges; (4) "The Foundations of a Free University" by Dorothy Emmet; (5) "Christianity's Need for a Free University" by Alec R. Vidler; (6) "Universities under Fire" by Colin Forrester-Paton; (7) "Calling all Freshmen" by Paul White; (8) "Work and Vocation" by W. G. Simons; and (9) "Vocational and Humane Education in the University" by L. A. Reid.)

The Idea of a Responsible University in Asia Today. By M. M. Thomas, editor. Geneva: World's Student Christian Federation, 1953, and reprinted in 1954.

Liberal Learning and Religion. Amos N. Wilder, editor. New York: Harper and Bros., 1951.

Not Minds Alone. By Kenneth Irving Brown. New York: Harper and Bros., 1954. xv and 206 pages. \$3.00.

Here is a little book based on the same premises as those of *The Christian Scholar*. Education needs the dynamic of a religious faith. The ultimate values in which colleges believe, or must believe if they are to get on with their job, are religious values. And even as the life of scholarship, at its best, calls for conscious allegiance to the moral and spiritual insights of the Hebrew-Christian tradition, so

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

Christianity, at its best, must be true to the ideal of scholarship.

Kenneth I. Brown is in an excellent position to develop these premises. Formerly President first of Hiram and then of Denison, he is now Executive Director of the Danforth Foundation. In these posts, as in his earlier teaching career, he has consistently worked for a concept and a practice of higher education that can properly be called Christian. This volume represents his considered testimony on what he believes to be fundamental issues for the present campus scene.

He begins with "Questions Both Pertinent and Impertinent" which lay bare the problem of a higher education not adequately informed by religious values. But "Seeds of Hope" are present: Brown performs a useful service by gathering information about the various organizations and movements which in the last decade have attacked the problem. He calls attention, particularly, to the work of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education and of the Hazen and Danforth Foundations, and to study and discussion projects under various sponsorship.

Aware that he has large support, therefore, he addresses himself to the question, "Can Education be Meaningfully Christian?" What seems to be in the way? Brown notes three positions: the supposed antagonism of religion to a free search for truth, the unenlightened attitudes of some educators to religion, and the sectarianism within religion itself. But these, he shows, need not be stumbling blocks to an affirmative answer. What, then, are the necessary conditions? Again he discusses three: that Christian education must meet all the qualitative standards set by secular education; that, centering its attention on "not minds alone" but whole persons, it must show its concern for the religious growth of its students by seeking men and women of conscious and contagious faith for its faculty and staff; and that it must give continual eye to the total impact upon the students, that they be encouraged to develop an understanding of God's will for their lives and a love for their fellows.

Such a prescription goes far beyond the usual suggestions made in answer to such a question. Education can become Christian, we are often told, by a more careful attention to the development of a religious program on the campus—to courses, and chapel, and voluntary activities. Brown's own career shows that he does not disparage these devices, but his book implies that all of these together are indecisive, and essentially irrelevant, if the three main conditions which he discusses are not met. Here is healthy effort to get into the heart of what education is all about. There is hardly a college administrator or faculty member in the country who would not profit from reading Brown's analysis.

There follow at this point three chapters designed "to outline the responsibilities of the Christian student, the Christian teacher, the Christian administrator," respectively. Each is thoughtful and useful. For my part I found the third, "Some Problems of Creative Leadership," to be the most provocative. This may be true both because I know Brown is writing about college administration out of a full

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

experience and because I myself am engaged in such activities, God forgive me; but I think the major reason is that, whereas much is being written these days about the Christian responsibility of the student and the teacher, the administrator is not being given the same careful scrutiny. Brown makes the college president face up to his obligations with respect to Christian education, and his words have the ring of authority.

He returns to his overall contention in the two final sections in the book, "The Measure of a Christian College" and "The Way Ahead." In the first of these he tackles the difficult question, How is one to know? How will the Christian college be recognizable? He suggests that the examiner should use six "measures" in his investigation: "student conversation," "student campus life," "fundamental faculty assumptions," "administrative policies," "campus outreach," and "total campus impact." At the end of his discussion one is still aware that the Christian temper of a campus cannot be put inside a testtube, but neither need judgment rest on personal boast alone. "The Way Ahead" consists in strengthening a number of specific activities and programs which he mentions, but most of all it calls, too, for careful attention to the intangibles, the application of "intelligence and patient vigilance and spiritual sensitivity" to the task of building a truly Christian higher education.

Merrimon Cuninggim

Higher Education and the Human Spirit. By Bernard E. Meland. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953. 204 pages. \$4.00.

"Despite all evidence to the contrary, the intellectual experience is the core of the college and of the university," writes Professor Meland out of a rich teaching experience both in Pomona, California and Chicago, Illinois. And he would steer, rightly I think, a middle course between the pragmatic philosophy of Dewey and the rationalism of Hutchins. He is correct, too, in holding that those masters are so far apart largely because they both lack "a considered view of the *appreciative* consciousness as it operates upon the intellect, informing and sensitizing its nature." We need, further, an educational philosophy of the *whole* man; and in this Professor Meland is at one with the affirmative attitude towards "Religious Perspectives in the Preparation of Teachers" by Professor Ulich of Harvard. So West meets East in the hub of the nation's traffic.

Some readers may be put off by the very specific school of thought to which Mr. Meland belongs: "The line of enquiry leading down from James's deeper empiricism . . . through the creative thought of Bergson and the British philosophers of emergence, into the metaphysics of Whitehead, and the present-day Chicago school of religious empiricists." I myself find references to "psychic proto-

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

plasm," "psychic soil," "the vitalities" and the like, uncongenial to say the least. And the content of post-Incarnation history, with its dreadful polarities, is obscured if we concentrate, as we are urged to do, on the study of "the Bible as the primal document of (our) culture" followed almost exclusively by an enquiry into the historic elaboration of the Christian drama of redemption in ritual, art, song, and pagentry. And I remain baffled by a view of the "creaturely" in man which on p. 26 is identified as a level of more or less mechanical response, but which by p. 151 has become a normal level of sensibility "susceptible to the sense of mystery and wonder."

These points are not so much blemishes in a good book as inevitable, and defensible, results of a well-argued central position that the "distinctive dimension of religion" is "aspirational outreach." The position is for this reviewer highly and properly characteristic of natural religion, that ladder with a rungless top which reaches not to Heaven but far enough for finite and defective creatures to grasp on to God's "inspirational downreach," if I may coin a rather horrid phrase. Many Christians, whether Catholic or Protestant, and also Conservative Jews, will wish however to supplement and transform the living water of this treatise with that headier wine still contained in or orthodox but perhaps too cobwebby bottles.

T.S.K. Scott-Craig

The Philosophy of William Dilthey. By H. A. Hodges. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1952. 368 pages. 28 shillings. *Languages, Standpoints, and Attitudes.* By H. A. Hodges. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1953. 68 pages. 5 shillings.

Professor H. A. Hodges of the University of Reading is a careful historical scholar and interpreter and in addition is a systematic thinker of commanding acumen and skill. Readers of his brief *Christianity and the Modern World View* (1949) will be pleased to be engaged again by an interesting argument and a discerning dialectic in *Languages, Standpoints, and Attitudes*. But here the author addresses himself to the problems raised by modern linguistic-oriented philosophy. Readers of Mr. Hodges' earlier *Wilhelm Dilthey: An Introduction* will be likewise pleased to find in the new and long Dilthey work a detailed and patient piece of writing, appreciative yet critical, and one which bountifully illuminates a very important but somewhat difficult thinker of the recent past. The latter work is made especially relevant for English and American readers by several well chosen comparisons between Dilthey and Collingwood, and, to a lesser extent, Croce.

Mr. Hodges' Riddell Memorial Lectures (LS&A above) indicate that their author is not anticipating, as so many religious writers do, the immediate demise of contemporary philosophy and least of all because of superficial critiques and ostensi-

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

sible 'predicaments'. It may be a token of divine grace—but in any case, Mr. Hodges takes recent philosophy seriously, probably because he does not expect very much more from any philosophy including his own. He finds historical justification for the transference of concern from metaphysics to epistemology, from the doctrine of being to man the thinker, from things to categories. His study of Dilthey augments this account considerably by disclosing the endeavor of an earlier thinker who with a somewhat different result also was denying as do our contemporaries, absolutes, transcendent natures, and transcendent meanings of history and of values. Professor Hodges proposes in fact that analytic linguistic philosophy is not radical enough.

He boldly suggest that cognitive statements, if they are true, are one of the following: a. if they are certain, they are then tautological or 'purely' empirical (i.e., an exact report of what the *sensa* are, not the object); b. if they are conditionally true, they are so because they are related to the world and to the knower. But, what relates them to the world and to knowers? Neither logic nor experience, neither inference nor intuition. Cognitive reference, the 'aboutness' of sentences that makes them relevant, is not strictly a cognitive matter. The transcendentals of Kant, the presuppositions of Collingwood, and the standpoints of Mr. Hodges are words to describe the extra-cognitive but essential components within knowledge. The author argues that modern analysis ought to be carried to 'standpoints' and to the perspectival and attitudinal levels from which reflection and intellectual structure get their variety and reference and meanings.

With his contemporaries, Mr. Hodges finds metaphysical, and I suppose theological, certainties to express confusion especially when no other categories can be found for the alternative views other than those appropriate to error. But, unlike most of the contemporaries, the author does not find metaphysics meaningless. He proposes instead that metaphysical views may be an expression of these necessary (not logically necessary but pragmatically so!) standpoints and attitudes. But, this review perhaps makes Mr. Hodges sound like the professor of metaphysics who out of desperation insists that everybody has his metaphysics anyway; actually Professor Hodges is not so banal. He too is willing to give up the extravagances of the philosophic past; he is not willing to give up all respect for the endeavors of most of the philosophers of the past even while admitting ambiguities and even linguistic confusions. Further, the author is as disturbed with the dogmatism of contemporary philosophy as he is with the dogmatism of the metaphysicians. Both have missed, he avers, the fact that attitudes and standpoints are several and that they issue in a drama and a dialectic without thereby being reduced or subsumed or 'aufgehoben' into the 'true' metaphysics. All of this is said not perfectly to be sure, but in a form which makes the view capable of further extension and refinement. Mr. Hodges' interest in the Christian faith is explicit and seems to gain rather than to lose exactness and breadth from his earn-

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

est endeavor to use contemporary modes of expression and understanding.

His study of Dilthey is if anything even better done than the briefer work. It is a work of great detail. It likewise ought to appeal to students of widely differing interests. The rich suggestiveness of Dilthey on history and 'historical reason', on human studies, on values and their matrices, on the philosophical currents of the day and the past,—all of these are made very vivid by Mr. Hodges' style and organization of material. Dilthey's influence is sufficiently great upon the theological currents of recent times to make this book a fine addition to the study of theology itself. But, more than this, Dilthey was as troubled by the fragmentary and the superficial uses and purposes to which knowledge could be put and the inconclusiveness of philosophies as we are today. He makes a fitting subject for contemporary study. Many of the points made in Mr. Hodges' systematic work (LS&A) reflect his long-time preoccupation with Dilthey. But where Dilthey found the human studies to be the ground of optimism, Hodges finds Christianity to be that ground.

The issues with which Professor Hodges is concerned are the central ones in the Anglo-Saxon intellectual world. Whether one reads modern philosophy or not, almost every branch of learning today seem to sustain attitudes for which contemporary philosophy is but a reflective and more technical expression. It is the merit of Professor Hodges to have seen this and to have attacked the question with a freshness and an originality that holds promise for every Christian who endeavors to maintain his intellectual integrity while yet worshipping Jesus Christ.

Paul L. Holmer

A Prisoner for God. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. \$2.50. (Also, *Letters and Papers from Prison*. London: S. C. M. Press, 1953.)

"'Could you not watch with me one hour?' asks Jesus in Gethsemane. This is the reversal of everything which the religious man expects from God."

Dietrich Bonhoeffer could easily have been called Germany's most promising young theologian when he wrote these words from his prison cell in Berlin-Tegel in 1944. He was the German Confessing Church's solidest bridge toward the Anglo-Saxon world. He did not live to fulfill this promise. He became instead the Church's most honored martyr. But when his life, filled with a hundred plans, tasks and hopes in the Church, in theology, in the ecumenical movement, and in the political resistance against Hitler, was suddenly constricted into the confines of a prison cell, Bonhoeffer had time to think and write while the whole intense drama of the modern world still tingled in his soul. These letters, poems, and bits of writing

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

addressed to intimate friends, are the result. The life which the martyr could not live out is here raised to the quintessence of its meaning. The lines of a new theology, a generation ahead of its time, are here suggested and bequeathed to us.

This is, therefore, a revolutionary book. Its words are signposts for all of us who are concerned to live as Christians, just because they are not the words we are used to hearing. The world, says Bonhoeffer, has become mature. For centuries it has been crowding religious dependence from one area another of its life. This process is now complete, save for a few remnants. The world is non-religious, self-sufficient, secular, and it must be accepted as such, for God has made it so. Precisely this secular maturity may well be closer to God than religious dependence.

Christ and Christian faith have always been understood religiously, except for a few lucid years in apostolic times, and again in the Reformation. But Christ for us today, like the Christ of the New Testament, stands in a different relation to the world, a relation of service, and of suffering love. Faith is not assent to certain articles and propositions—this is to make a new Law out of freedom from the Law—but participation in the being of Jesus in this world, with all that this implies. But this is not liberalism, though Bonhoeffer loves and takes responsibility for the culture, politics, and emotional ties of his bourgeois world as deeply as any liberal. One comes from reading this book richer by a world of sensitive insights into the meaning of friendship, family love, art, music, and the whole range of full bourgeois living. Bonhoeffer longed for and lived with this world to the end of his days. But liberalism, he believed, had allowed the world to assign Christ his place within it. It thought from man toward God instead of from God toward man, and this is false humanism.

"It is not with the Beyond, but with this world that we should be concerned, as this world has been created, sustained, integrated by laws, reconciled, and renewed. That which is beyond the world is, in the Gospel, for the world, I mean that not in the anthropocentric sense of liberal, mystic, pietist, ethical theology, but in the Biblical sense of Creation, and the incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection of Jesus Christ."

For Bonhoeffer, religious liberalism is an extension of pietism, "methodism" as he calls it (unjustly?) and they stand together even with such great names as Paul Tillich, Karl Heim, and Rudolf Bultmann (with an incidental swipe at the "philosopher of religion"—as distinct from theologian—Reinhold Niebuhr) and the great mass of preachers and teachers, German and otherwise, in an illegitimate attempt to force the mature world back to its religious childhood. This great fraternity is all engaged in "apologetics": the attempt to clear a place in the world where God may still reign as working hypothesis of thought, to find a human weakness or extremity which they can pounce on to prove that man after all cannot do without God's tutelage, to persuade men that they are sinners, despisers, weak, helpless, in order to create in them a desire to be saved and the habit of thinking

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

once more "religiously" ("metaphysically" and "individualistically" as Bonhoeffer defines it.).

For this sort of business Bonhoeffer reserves his sharpest words.

"The religious (apologists) speak of God when human knowledge has reached its limit (often purely from mental laziness), or when human powers fail. It is really always a *deus ex machina* whom they trot out, either to provide a seeming solution of insoluble problems or as strength to meet human failure, always therefore to make use of human weaknesses on the boundaries of human life. This works perforce only and always until men push their boundaries a bit further out by their own power and make the *deus ex machina* superfluous again.—I would like to speak of God not on the boundary, but in the middle, not in the weaknesses of life, but in its strengths, not in guilt and death but in life and in the God."

"The attack of Christian apologetics on the maturity of the world, I hold to be in the first place senseless, in the second place ill-bred, in the third place unChristian. Senseless—because it seems to me to be an attempt to set a grown man back into his puberty; that is, to make him dependent on things on which he simply no longer depends, and to force upon him problems which are no longer problems for him. Ill-bred—because here human weaknesses are made use of in the interest of purposes which are alien to the man concerned, which he does not freely affirm. UnChristian—because Christ is confused with a certain level of human religiosity, that is, with a human law."

"Heim made the pietist-methodist attempt to convince the individual man that he stood before the alternative: 'Despair or Jesus.' He won souls."

"Tillich undertook to explain the world itself—against its will—religiously, to give it its form through religion. This was brave of him, but the world threw him from the saddle and galloped on alone. He also wanted to understand the world better than it understood itself. But the world felt itself completely understood and rejected the imputation."

So the pietist emphasis on individual salvation and eternal life, and the liberal attempt to find a place for God in this world are basically the same thing. The break-through occurred in the theology of which Karl Barth was the pioneer. Here the world as it is, was understood from God's revelation in Christ, and not from its own thoughts and apparent moods. But Barth himself fell back into a "positivism of revelation." He relied too much on words and dogmas, which became a new Law for the believer, and remained irrelevant for the secular man in factory, home and office. It may be, says Bonhoeffer, that we can no longer convey the Word of God by words in this age, but only by deeds, responsible decisions, the proper balance between resistance and surrender, "the profound this-worldliness which is full of discipline, and in which the knowledge of death and resurrection is ever present."

"Whether a human deed is a matter of faith or not, is decided by whether

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

a man understands his suffering as a continuation of his deed, as a fulfillment of his freedom or not."

We stand here on the threshold of the deepest and most delicate insight of this book, that of the hidden discipline of Christian life and community. Bonhoeffer is as anti-monastic as every follower of the faith of the Reformers, but we have here the suggestion of an evangelical-protestant way of profunder Christian life than is possible in either the world or average church. There are levels of knowledge, and of experience, and the deeper ones are only known through the discipline of Christian obedience, and the experience of a community with the Word of God. But precisely this depth and this experience may become for the Christian a barrier to the world and for the world an offense. Therefore, for the sake of the Gospel itself, for the sake of the respect which God commands for other men the Christian community must often be more than it reveals itself to be. The springs of its action may and must remain hidden from those unprepared to partake of their water. In the words of a German interpreter:

"At all those points where to make visible the treasure of the Church (Christ) might work as a reproach against her and discourage those who stand outside, the Church can and ought to lay a veil over it; not to deny her vocation, her heritage, or her Lord, but precisely to invite the world to Him in the self-renunciation which He himself prefigured for us." (*Schlingensiepen in Evangelische Theologie*, August, 1953)

Charles C. West

The Religion of the Hindus. By Kenneth W. Morgan, editor. New York: The Ronald Press, 1953. xii and 434 pages. \$5.00.

This is an important addition to the books available in English on Hinduism. Its six chapters on beliefs and practices are written by Indian scholars of note who are at the same time believers, and the book owes its distinctiveness to this combination of qualities. It has been ably planned and edited by Professor Kenneth Morgan of Colgate University.

The chapters include an excellent introduction to the nature and history of Hinduism, statements on Hindu notions about God, man, and nature, a description of the wide range of practices that make up Hindu *dharma*, and a clear analysis of the teachings of the major philosophical schools. Perhaps the most unusual of the chapters is that on nature, for there is set forth the consequences of the view of the natural world as full of sacred power, and therefore capable of operating by itself. It is believed that natural objects such as the stars or particular foods directly influence human lives, or again that excessive growth of certain flowers may presage disasters. Trees and plants are viewed as "full of consciousness." These notions are not always presented without criticism, but the reader is fre-

BOOKS AND PUBLICATIONS

quently uncertain whether the writer speaks as believer or as reporter. The chapter gives access, however, to a side of Hinduism rarely presented in western books.

The last third of the book is a collection from the Hindu scriptures. The writings selected are, we are told, those familiar to the devout Hindu from being heard in temples and villages, or spoken as parts of scared ritual. One sees the scriptures as they are used by the faithful worshipper who relates himself to nature and the divine by the potent word spoken or the revealing story heard. It is a very different sort of collection from that in most anthologies where an objective, historical norm is assumed.

The value of the book lies, then, in its presentation of the believer's view, but difficulties for the western reader spring from this orientation. Except in the chapter on philosophical thought he may be startled by the alien character of the assumptions, or the apparent ignoring of distinctions. How, for instance, one can affirm both the "identity of the Supreme Being and the universe" and the divine transcendence is not clear. Certain other problems arise either from the conglomerate nature of Hinduism or from the methods of subdividing the subject. Repetition is by no means avoided; caste is twice discussed at length, and the numerous gods with their attendants and cults seem to overrun the pages. Description outweighs analysis, and details are perhaps too numerous. The almost complete lack of historical perspective is to some degree a drawback. It is attempted in the introduction and in incidental critical comments, but the directions of change never become clear.

But even if all difficulties were not solved, the unity within Hinduism as well as its contradictions appear, and western readers may be grateful for this sympathetic statement of the religion of a great people.

Virginia Corwin

Contributors to the Books and Publications Section

Dr. Virginia Corwin, Professor of Religion and Biblical Studies at Smith College, has contributed chapters to both the *Vitality of the Christian Tradition* and *Liberal Learning and Religion*.

Dr. Merrimon Cuninggim is Dean of the Perkins School of Theology in Dallas, and author of *The College Seeks Religion*.

Dr. Paul L. Holmer, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Minnesota, is currently on leave of absence while he is engaged in post-graduate studies in Denmark.

Dr. T. S. K. Scott-Craig, currently on leave of absence from Dartmouth College, is Executive Chairman for Faculty Work of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The Rev. Charles C. West is a Presbyterian missionary on furlough, engaged in graduate studies at Yale Divinity School.

Reports and Notices

Reports From Regions on University Concerns

During the past several years there has been increased vitality, in at least many parts of the world, among college and university teachers as they considered the meaning of their vocations as Christians, the nature and purposes of higher education, and the relevance of their professed faith to the disciplines in which they exercised their scholarship. Many of these developments took place in direct relation to the University Commission, which has been described in earlier portions of this issue and whose concerns form the substance of some of its articles. Other activities were wholly autonomous, though in varying degrees they were stimulated by the work of the Commission. Information is not in hand to present a complete diary of all that has been taking place. The following reports are intended to supplement data found elsewhere (particularly in certain issues of the *Student World* and the *Federation News Sheet*, especially its issue for September-October, 1953, Vol. XIII, No. 5, which is entirely devoted to the University Commission), and to bring certain reports up to date.

Britain. Philip Lee-Woolf, General Secretary of the British S.C.M., reports that "a large number of Christian university teachers, and some non-Christians as well, are gathered in many University centres, into Dons' groups, which vary quite remarkably in pattern." He illustrates this dual assertion by speaking of the groups at Swansea, Exeter, Leeds, Cambridge, Newcastle, Glasgow, St. Andrews, Manchester, and Aberdeen. While all of these involve members from various faculties, he notes that "another type of group brings together specialists in a particular subject; it is represented by Professor Dorothy Emmet's Philosophy group, and by the History group led by Dr. Marjorie Reeves and Dr. Nicholas Zernov in Oxford.

"At a meeting of the Dons' Advisory Group (the central committee for coordinating activities) after the March, 1952, Conference, it was agreed that the next Dons' Conference should not be along 'Moberly lines', but should be a small, longer Study Conference, with Bible study, theological lectures and seminars, to provide the chance of theological study for university teachers. The Study Conference was held in March, 1953. Canon T. R. Milford was chaplain and led Bible Study, Principal N. Micklem gave five theological

lectures, and we had seminars on H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture*, led by Professor Robert L. Calhoun of Yale, on Karl Heim's *The Transformation of the Scientific World View*, led by Professor Ian Ramsey of Oxford, and on *Imagery in Poetry and Religion* led by Miss Welsford of Cambridge, and finishing up with a study of Farrer's book on *The Glass of Vision*. The only session that we had on 'Moberly lines' was a talk by Michael Foster (of Oxford, Chairman of the Dons' Advisory Group).

"This seems to me to typify our position in Britain. If you distinguish three strands in the University question — 1) The Mission of the University and its Christian Significance; 2) The Relation between Christianity and Particular Studies; and 3) The Personal and Social Lives of Christian Dons and Students — we seem to be most active on 3).

"Under the second head, perhaps most significant work will come from individuals (Butterfield, Coulson, Hodges, Dingle) and cannot very well be organised. There are of course the specialist groups referred to, but they must obviously remain personal and autonomous. We badly need more of them, especially a social science one. A scientists' group has been started up in London with a very wide selection of working scientists and some interested laymen, and it has been discussing scientific methodology now for about a year, but it is so diverse that it will need at least another year to develop its full power. Another interesting variant has been to get together a three-cornered group of linguistic philosophers, literary critics and Biblical theologians on the question of "Imagery." This was done early in 1953 when Dorothy Emmet enlarged the regular meeting of her Philosophy group. Some interesting papers were read, one of which was published in *The Christian Scholar* for June, 1953.

"With regard to 1) Foster is probably right when he says that our role will be increasingly conservative. The university in Britain still has a fundamentally liberal character which it is important to preserve. Maybe our traditions would not survive attack, but we cannot abandon them before they are attacked."

Professor Michael Foster undoubtedly adds to this, in his letter to members of the D.A.G. written in early '53, when he reports: "Someone remarked to me at a

REPORTS AND NOTICES

Christian conference last summer (it is perhaps not without significance that the speaker was a member of the Eastern Orthodox Church), 'these conferences are a new form of Church life.' It seemed to me then, and has seemed since, a true and profound remark. To think of a conference like this is to be freed from the pressing necessity of producing results, either in the way of intellectual achievement or of practical resolutions. It is to be free to celebrate without ulterior motives, and to let the results grow as fruits. Should not Dons' groups be thought of somewhat in this light? — as groups from which indeed practical consequences may flow, but which are not there primarily in order to produce them? — which are there primarily in order to celebrate, though not in order to say that they are celebrating?"

Another Swanwick Conference is now being planned for March, 1955, on the theme: "Christian and Scientific Beliefs." A full announcement will appear in this journal at a later time.

Continental Europe. As this section is being written full reports from all countries are not in hand. However, two regional conferences have been held which are of special interest. Last summer a student leaders' course was held at Mainau, Germany (this is reported upon in full in the Federation News Sheet referred to above). It was a worthwhile attempt to make the university discussions relevant to the concerns of students and to break the deadlock in communication on this question between Britain and Continental Europe. Arising out of this course, a study outline on the vocation of the Christian student in the university has been written and will be published shortly. Early in February of this year a European University Consultation was held in Mulheim/Ruhr; it focused primary attention upon the pastoral needs of the student, but this concern was set within the context of the problem of the university which is isolated from society and which, nevertheless, has a clear opportunity and responsibility as a force in the transformation of society. A number of reports on developments in various countries were presented by members of the Consultation, following which a discussion on the central theme was introduced by Leila Giles of the Federation's staff. She stressed particularly that pastoral care is not remedial, but creative.

In Holland, in a recently formed (April, 1953) Foundation, *Protus* (Stichting Protestants Universitair Studiewerk), several

groups have joined hands to promote "the study of the problem of faith and scientific knowledge," according to a recent report by the Dutch S.C.M. Study Secretary, Dr. E. van Bruggen. The groups which are co-operating are (1) a group of Protestant professors from the non-denominational universities, (2) the student-pastors of the "Hervormde" and the "Gereformeerde" churches, (3) the Netherlands Christian Students Association (N.C.S.V.), and (4) the Liberal Christian Students' Alliance (V.C.S.B.). "Each of these groups has worked more or less on the problems of faith and the scientific vocation and they will go on doing so. These central groups have the additional task of preparing and organising conferences on central themes. This year the N.C.S.V. is working on the problem of "Communication", the V.C.S.B. on questions of Anthropology (in the German sense), both from the point of view of liberal protestantism. Locally some groups are studying such subjects as Physics and the Christian faith, 'Belief and Scientific Thinking in Economics,' and 'The Knowledge of History.'

"*Protus* has been given the task of stimulating this work by acting as a documentation centre where the results of the groups are filed for further reference and by keeping up a bibliography on special topics, directly regarding the central problems; not only is it to stimulate further study but also to introduce students of other faculties in the different spheres of scientific knowledge and their relation to the Christian faith. To compose these pamphlets we try to mobilize little working groups of students and professors. Also *Protus* will stimulate contacts between students of theology and those of other faculties.

"We have in our files some documents concerning work done in the recent past, especially by the N.C.S.V. But not all the results of the study groups have been recorded. (1) About Academic Freedom and Responsibility there is an interesting statement by Dr. Loen (a Dutch Christian philosopher) on 'Faith, Ideology, and the Freedom of Scientific Research,' in which freedom for the truth in scientific work is compared with our being bound in faith, with the conclusion that faith is necessary for academic freedom, because it frees scientific research from other ideological trends. (2) About the relations of knowledge and belief we have reports of study conferences on the themes, 'Faith and Psychology,'

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

'Prayer and Healing,' and 'Faith and Physics.' (3) On the purpose of study there has been some work in medical, juridical, and economic fields. Some of the other studies have resulted in articles in the monthly, *Wending*, a periodical published by the Hervormde Church (Nos. 5 and 6, 1953), in special numbers on medical problems."

Asia. It will be interesting to many to know that our colleague, Professor Arnold Nash of the University of North Carolina, has been spending most of this year in India. Early in December, Mr. Komla Jacob of the National Christian Council in India wrote to report that Professor Nash had already had useful conferences with teachers in Colleges. "At the moment," he writes, "he is in Allahabad, which will be his headquarters for the rest of the time that he is in India. Already there is evidence of the interest that has been aroused among some College teachers as a result of these conferences. Our Board of Christian Higher Education will be meeting here in Nagpur on January 19 and 20 and Nash will be present."

There have been two new developments in Asia generally. But the full significance of these developments cannot be assessed until all reports and impressions are in hand. They are, however, worthy of special mention. The first is the program of inter-Asian visitation by three Christian professors, Mrs. Anamma Varki of India, Dr. Hla Bu of Burma, and Dr. Imada of Japan. Mrs. Varki visited Burma, Thailand, Hongkong, the Philippines, and Japan, the major time being given to Japan. Dr. Hla Bu and Dr. Imada visited Japan and India respectively. Their schedule of visits, aided by the Hazen Foundation, included visits of universities, meetings with students and professors (both Christian and non-Christian) and consultations with S.C.M. leaders. Mrs. Varki and Dr. Hla Bu had opportunities to meet with the University Teachers' Commission in Japan to share both news and views of their responsibilities.

The second in these developments is reported by the Rev. Harry Daniel, who at the present time is convener for the Asian region with Dr. David G. Moses. He writes about the attempts to bring about Christian-non-Christian conversations among the teachers on the idea of a responsible university. "Here in India," he writes, "especially the discussion has broadened out between Christians and non-Christians and we have had a meeting of professors of Mathematics and Physics with Dr. John Coleman, and another meeting of professors of Social Science subjects with

Dr. Arnold Nash. And, the University Teachers' Conference planned for December, 1953 has been postponed to April of 1954 and will be held in Nagpur. This is the one big experiment we are making in India. In Madras many members of the S.C.M. University Commission are in positions of leadership in the Area Association and we are planning again through that body to initiate discussions on the university question between Christians and non-Christians." Along this line a new development may lie ahead of the University Commission in Asia. However, not too much should be expected, because it demands a capacity on the part of Christians to live on the frontier as Christians and communicate their ultimate concern for the divine purposes for the secular areas of life, in the university, in challengingly relevant secular terms. This demand is not easily met and needs radical revolution in the Christian's pattern of life and thought. But along this route lies the future of the Christian witness in Asia universities.

Conferences of Christian teachers in India, Burma, Japan, and the Philippines were aimed at strengthening the sense of responsibility that they have to think out the implications of their faith in their vocations. Japan may be taken as an illustration of their concern at this point.

During the past three years the University Commission in Japan has held a number of conferences and study groups. Among the topics discussed are the following: "Characteristics of Asian Society," "Characteristics of the Japanese Working Class," "Problems of Rural Villages in Japan," "Education and Philosophy," "The Social Sciences," "The Natural Sciences," "The Method and Task of Precise Science," "Interchanges between Social Science and Natural Science," "Formation of Modern Science and the Tradition of Protestantism," and "Problems for the Natural Sciences and Education in the University under the New System." This shows the wide range of interests in the new work of this Commission in Japan. The problem of "community" has been posed for discussion at future conferences; at the same time however, more efforts are also being made to popularize the university problem for many others in the academic communities. Study conferences, research work in small groups, the publication of pamphlets, and the further development of a movement among teachers' colleges seem to be the remaining activities which are receiving primary attention.

REPORTS AND NOTICES

United States of America. Many and varied types of faculty Christian groups, consultations, and conferences have been developing during the past decade or more; they are currently moving forward with increasing vitality and depth. It may be impossible for us to mention all of these, but certain primary developments can be reported upon briefly.

For some years now, three independent groups have been hard at work. The National Council on Religion in Higher Education is a company of "fellows" devoted to the task described in its title, the providing of some assistance to graduate students through Kent Fellowships for study toward a teaching career, and the annual meeting of the members at its "Week of Work." Elsewhere in this number a more complete description is given. The Edward W. Hazen Foundation has left its impact in various ways, but notably (upon American teachers) through several excellent series of pamphlets and week-long Hazen Conferences, held in various parts of the country. "Central in the conferences through the years has been the assumption," reports a folder describing them, "that religion is a basic component of higher education and that religious values are of fundamental import to those working with college students. A unique aspect of the gatherings has been the inclusion of those who approach the student from a wide variety of directions, as teachers, administrators, counselors, religious workers — or from fields of health, scholarship, psychology, recreation, faith — while drawn together by their concern for enhancing through the total community life of the college the development of persons equipped to assume leadership in contemporary society." Fifty one such conferences were held between 1929 and 1949; three are being held this summer.

The work of the Danforth Foundation has encompassed a wide range of activities, including recruitment of some of our best college graduates to the teaching vocation, stimulating them and active college teachers to conceive of their tasks in Christian terms through regular summer conferences, opening up avenues for student and faculty relations through the "Danforth Associates" program, providing assistance through "Danny Grads" who help in various religious activities, challenging and assisting in the building of prayer chapels on university campuses, and, most recently, the granting of special funds to assist local faculty study groups, conferences, or consultations, on twelve campuses for the next year.

The first two named of the above groups joined with the American Council on Education in a cooperatively sponsored program of faculty consultations from 1945-48. Dr. Albert C. Outler, now on the faculty of the Perkins School of Theology, describes the program fully in a pamphlet, "Colleges, Faculties, and Religion," published by the Hazen Foundation. A total of 53 such consultations were held in 29 states; 16 different consultants were involved; and colleges and universities were of all types represented in the American scene. Of these consultations, Dr. Outler writes: "The typical consultation consisted of a personal visit by an established scholar and teacher to a campus upon the invitation of the administration and a faculty committee of the college or university. The consultant usually spoke to the faculty on some aspect of the general theme of religion in higher education and thereafter joined a series of smaller groups of faculty and administrators for prolonged discussion of the implications of his general thesis. Usually an interview with a representative student group was included, and infrequently, an address in the college chapel."

We should also note that the University Christian Mission, which conducts some thirty or forty "missions" each year and has given leadership to the patterns of religious emphasis weeks on hundreds of American campuses, included some special missions to faculty members during recent years. Moreover, meetings with teachers are regularly included in its religious emphasis weeks, and these tend to be important growing points for continued fellowships of faculty on many campuses.

During the past ten years, the National Student Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. have been actively engaged in work with college and university teachers. The committee on Religion in Higher Education, which was described more fully in the December, 1953, issue of this publication, has been particularly influential in involving Christian students and faculty members in fundamental thinking about the nature and program of higher education, and the special responsibilities of Christians in academic life. This Committee has given excellent assistance both in local situations and in various regions for work at the faculty level, the organization and support of local study groups, and the assistance in regional faculty conferences. Conferences on an intercollegiate level are now being held on a regular basis by the three regional S.C.M.s (New England, New York, and Mid-Atlantic regions), and involve sponsorship of not only the Y's

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

but also some of the churches. They are also being held, in somewhat direct relation to Y staff, in such states as Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and others; some regional conferences, such as the effective one in the South-west region, are held regularly. Many other conferences of an intercollegiate or regional type are being held more or less regularly, or are now in prospect.

All of the Protestant Churches that carry on an active program in higher education, either through their related colleges or through their student work and movements, or both, have, of course, been cognizant of the need that they provide ministries also to members of faculties. For the most part, however, this has, until recent years, been without specific consciousness of the special requirements called for in the relation of the church to college and university teachers. In two of the denominations, some such conscious efforts were, nevertheless, being made prior to 1950 to 52 (the period during which the Faculty Christian Fellowship was in its earliest stages of formation). These are the Protestant Episcopal and Lutheran Churches. Provinces one, two, and three, of the Protestant Episcopal Church have, for four years, sponsored an "Institute in Theology" for College Faculty; the fifth of these, now under the auspices of the newly-incorporated Faculty Institute, will be held from June 14 to June 20 this summer at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut — it is open to all who are "interested in learning about the Christian religion and discussing the place of the scholar and teacher in it," as Professor Leicles-ter Bradner of Brown University, its Chairman, says. During 1952-53, and again this year, Professor T. S. K. Scott-Craig has been giving full-time direction to the Committee on Faculty Work of the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The report for his first year was published in the June, 1953, number of *The Christian Scholar*.

The Division of Student Service of the National Lutheran Council has, for some years, actively encouraged the holding of conferences for faculty members of Lutheran colleges. More recently it has encouraged the inauguration of Lutheran faculty discussions and study groups in non-Lutheran institutions, and, in a few cases, on an area basis. Between fifteen and twenty campus groups meet monthly or less frequently, and others are being launched. During the academic year 1952-53 six area conferences were held in the Central States; in other years, similar conferences

were held in other parts of the country. At the present time, expansion of the program is contemplated; but, as the Rev. Donald R. Heiges, Executive Secretary for the Division of Student Service, reports, "a *Lutheran Faculty Fellowship* on a *national* level should not be set up; we should concentrate our efforts on the local level with occasional area conferences, and whatever we do should be within the general framework of the Faculty Christian Fellowship."

Early in 1952, the Study Secretary of the United Student Christian Council, then Miss Nancie Blackie from England, was asked to bring together church and association representatives in a discussion of the future direction of faculty work and the possibilities of beginning an ecumenical fellowship of teachers. Two early consultations led, that autumn, to the formation of the Faculty Christian Fellowship. At its meeting in Berea, Kentucky, in October, 1952, an Executive Committee was elected and all of those who had shared in the earlier consultations and a few others were named as the Continuing Committee. A national conference was proposed; and, this conference was held at Park College in Missouri in June, 1953. A fuller history of this development, and many of the materials from the conference, have been published in the earlier issues of this publication. It is currently engaged in the stimulating and assisting of a large number of local faculty groups, the encouraging of some new groups, intercollegiate consultations and conferences, and joint sponsorship with other groups of two area conferences in June — one in New England and the other in North Carolina. It is involved also in clarifying its structure and purposes so that it may increasingly respond to the challenge that it provide national leadership. In addition, it may be fairly reported that the existence and challenges of the Fellowship have encouraged others of the denominations to engage more actively in faculty work. For example, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S. (Southern) has greatly expanded the work of the Professors' Section of the Presbyterian Educational Association of the South (which meets this year as a full-fledged Conference, June 8-12, at Montreat, North Carolina, and is sponsored jointly by it, the F.C.F., and the Methodist Church), placed on file the names of several thousand college and university teachers who are its church members, and has this spring given full time leadership to this area of its work through the efforts of Professor Rene de V. Williamson, who is on leave of absence from the University of Tennessee. The Methodist

REPORTS AND NOTICES

Church, too, has expanded its efforts in this direction; its full-time staff member is Dr. Richard N. Bender, formerly on the faculty of Baker University; regular contacts with a large number of faculty members are maintained through the news-letter, *Campus Religion*; and, a faculty committee is responsible for giving guidance to the total interest in this field.

Other churches too are gaining a new appreciation of their responsibilities in relation to college and university teachers. Several have work in varying stages of development; most of the churches are actively interested in giving support to the Faculty Christian Fellowship, somewhat on the pattern suggested by Pastor Heiges in the quotation from him cited above; and, all of the groups cooperating in the Department of Campus Christian Life of the National Council of Churches, to which the Faculty Christian Fellowship is related, are increasingly aware of the new frontiers in their ministry which the concerns of faculty members make possible. Future problems revolve around the question of how the Fellowship and the other initiatives may join in the most effective ways possible.

The true roots of the entire faculty movement, by whatever name and under whatever auspices, are of course to be found in local campus groups, meeting more or less regularly for fellowship, study, action, and prayer. The Executive Committee of the F.C.F. estimated recently that nearly one-half of the major campuses of the colleges and universities have such groups. They vary greatly as to size, number of meetings, sponsorship or relationship, and program. Very few are on a straight denominational pattern, drawing their membership from only one of the communions. None exist only on a departmental basis, as far as we know. Almost all are definitely guided by the initiative of faculty members themselves; they are open to all who are interested; and, the programs grow out of their concerns as members of the academic community and as teachers. In some places they are drawn together around the discussion of specific university questions; a considerable number meet for theological study and discussion and Tillich seems to be a favorite source; others join in the

study of the Bible with such help as critics, like C. H. Dodd and others, can give.

What is most important, however, about them is, first, that they depend upon a true sense of community and fellowship for their source of life. Since all such groups cut across the dividing lines of the disciplines, everyone is soon found involved in a discussion which concerns questions on which he is not an expert; then, the specialties begin to join in true community and something quite different from the Committee for the Examination of a Ph.D. Candidate begins to emerge. What is important about them, secondly, is that they help both in having Christians come to know and identify one another while at the same time they are challenged to join in reflections upon the meaning of their faith in relation to those who either approach Christianity from different traditions or who find it impossible to embrace it at all. Instead of digging in heels, choosing sides, and parting company, a semblance of the dialectic which is integral to the whole tradition both of faith and reason begins to appear. In a given instance, this can move forward creatively to new levels of experience for teachers who feel themselves frequently cut off from others, isolated in their own specialties, or unable to discuss calmly the issues of our "ultimate concern."

The third matter of importance with regard to these groups is that they are taking place among persons who have a healthy and genuine respect for the intellectual vocations, for education itself, and for the essential responsibilities of educators to culture and society. Concern with issues of faith does not represent "a flight from reason," therefore, but rather the attempt to understand anew and, perhaps, for the first time some of the dimensions of that Gospel which is inclusive of our whole life, intellectual as well as personal and social and world-wide. Committees of professors will, undoubtedly, not set themselves the task of re-writing the great Christian confessions, but new insights and depths are being explored by those who, primarily as laymen and laywomen, are engaged today in the new challenges of relating faith to thought and to action in our common life.

Report on a Philosophy-Theology Consultation

PAUL L. HOLMER

During September, 1953, a 'consultation' (as Professor Hendrick Kraemer called it) was held at the Ecumenical Institute, Bos-

sey, Switzerland. It was attended by twenty-two persons from eleven countries. Professors N. C. Nielsen (Rice Institute), Walter

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

Muelder (Boston University), Paul L. Holmer (University of Minnesota) and Paul Tillich were the U. S. representatives. Professor Tillich with his customary learning and vigor opened the week of three-a-day sessions with an endeavor to relate theology and philosophy by reference to an ontological structure, which, in being neither exclusively the province of theology nor philosophy, was yet the ultimate ground and unity of both. From the outset, it was clear that Mr. Tillich had a receptive audience among the continental Europeans — at least those present. It was a little surprising to learn that many English and American writings, including most of Tillich's later American writings, were not better known. A kind of loose 'a priori' understanding of American writings serves very badly to pre-judge particularly our philosophical and theological works. However, Tillich's strong leanings towards a kind of historical mode of stating and resolving problems coupled with his rich humanistic learning gave him immediately greater appropriateness to the kinds of concerns registered by the French and Swiss and German participants than he seemed to have to those most affected by strongly empirical and positivistic tendencies in the sciences and philosophy.

Tillich seeks to develop, as his readers well know, an ontological relation, not cosmological nor hierarchical and not, in the usual sense, metaphysical either, which roots in the ground of being and which is said to be ultimate both in the order of analysis and in the order of creation. With the reports that were given of situations respecting the relation between theology and philosophy in Germany, France, the United States, and England, it became clear that Tillich's mode of interpreting this relation was far more commodious to the intellectual debate among the Germans and the French than it was to the debate typical in learned circles in England and America. The English and the Americans and also the Scandinavians were cognizant and troubled by the strongly empirical and anti-metaphysical and anti-ontological and certainly anti-theological bent of contemporary philosophers. It was, according to Mr. Michael Foster, Fellow of Christ Church, Oxford University, not so much their results or their conclusions (in one sense they claim not to have any anyway) as it was the stringency of their questions, which, since they grew out of the history of philosophy, were devastatingly appropriate to its modern forms and any theologies using them. These questions, it seemed, were not very disturbing to most of the Germans and the French. And, one

must admit that when they are considered they lead to prolonged discussion upon the possibility of relations whereas Professor Tillich and a good number of the participants who were given even half a chance expounded the relation as they saw it at boundless length!

Repeatedly it was drawn to the participants attention that the Europeans certainly have their differences too. Barth, existentialism, the Catholic philosophies, phenomenology, Marxism and other views are alive and complicate the debate. But, it was also re-iterated that the historical problems and authors and works were still the staple items within the Universities and places of learning. As Paul Ricoeur said, however, "they are read within the new existential situation." And here a difference became apparent. The halls of learning seem more consecrated in continental Europe, more traditional and conservative, than in either England or America. But the political and social situation is quite different. Our halls of learning are full of confusion and cacophony and the past is only one of the clamoring voices; but our social scene is, despite its stresses and variety, in obvious continuity with the past and furthermore it still looks like a guarantor of decency and a present help, albeit ambiguous, in time of trouble. Our continuity is publicly and socially and historically and legally defined. Our conflicts are most strikingly apparent within the Universities where they engender such friendly chaos. Our 'existential situation' is not much different than it has been and most of us would not want to distinguish it by even calling it a situation. In contrast, existing is more problematic in Europe and the intellectual contexts and continuities seem far more pronounced and apparent.

To speak across this difference was itself a difficulty. One of the participants said blandly that the Germans had not learned anything since Kant and this was countered by a casual remark by another participant after the report on the American scene to the effect that neither the Americans nor the British had ever been able to understand what theology and philosophy really were anyway. To a striking extent the consultation was a failure on the most important issue, namely, the relation between theology and philosophy; for precisely here was it most evident that the definitions of both philosophy and theology were themselves problems within philosophy and theology and could not be resolved or stated without philosophical or theological acts of reflection. In another respect, the sessions were

REPORTS AND NOTICES

decidedly successful, for they indicated that God's grace was sufficient to bring a unity unmediated by the intelligence and quite untroubled by intellectual differences. This

kind of ecumenicity has no formula but is, nonetheless, one of the satisfactions that seems to surpass even those of the understanding.

The National Council on Religion in Higher Education

ELIZABETH G. WRIGHT

It is clear that Christian teachers in America are growing more articulate and self-critical about their distinctive concerns. Concurrently, they are becoming more aware of the existing groups which have already been active in relating religion to higher education. This article is designed to introduce you to one such group: The National Council on Religion in Higher Education. Speaking for the Council (as we shall call it here for convenience' sake), I hope that this self-portrait will serve as a helpful introductory interpretation to readers who know our organization slightly or not at all. In addition, several concrete suggestions are included in the closing paragraphs for your consideration.

The name itself — The National Council on Religion in Higher Education — is perhaps of dubious worth in this introduction. For (as one member of the Council has remarked) the members are more or less agreed on the meaning of "National;" but every other word in the title is just an excuse for starting a discussion! Discussion, in fact, is a prime characteristic of the Council's life. The members thrive upon a frank give-and-take on many issues; and they periodically engage in a corporate self-searching as to what the Council has been, is, and ought to be. Yet such questioning and reappraisal are always related to a basic purpose which has remained virtually unchanged. Therefore, despite the sturdy diversity of opinion within the Council, I think we can sketch a recognizable portrait of it.

The Council is not an ecclesiastical group. It is not affiliated in any way with the National Council of Churches, nor with any denomination — though many contacts and mutual concerns do exist. It is an autonomous body.

In some respects the Council resembles a professional society. The principal difference is the fact that its members do not join it through their own decision, but through a careful selection process. Most generally this selection process consists in election to a Kent Fellowship for graduate study. (These fellowships are more fully described below.) Thus the Council is comprised of a slowly

increasing group of Fellows, who ordinarily are admitted to the Council at the time of their graduate training, and who become lifetime participants and supporters. The Council is deliberately small in size, with a minimum of structure. In the Council's development and self-understanding, this form of organization has proved to be both a problem and (more significantly) a distinctive opportunity for service. The fellowship and the mutual criticism and encouragement which develop over the years are perhaps the most valuable results of the limited-membership system.

This pattern dates back to the Council's early years. The initiative for founding the Council in 1922 came from Professor Charles Foster Kent of Yale University, who was seriously concerned about the inadequacy of provisions for religion in American higher education. The establishment of schools of religion adjacent to many state universities during the twenties was largely due to the energetic efforts of Professor Kent. He also recognized the crucial importance of able, thoroughly trained, religious leadership on the campuses. The Kent Fellowships were designed to help meet this need. They continue to be awarded annually to selected college graduates (more rarely to college seniors) intending to work professionally in higher education, who show a mature religious orientation along with superior intellectual and personal qualities. These fellowships are by no means limited to theological students; in fact, applicants are welcomed from any field of study which contributes to a liberal education. Men and women of Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish faith may apply.*

What then does the Council *do*? The foreword in our Directory of Fellows answers that for thirty years the Council "has been actively at work . . . stimulating and assisting American colleges and universities to make more adequate provision for religion.

*March 1 is always the closing date for filing Kent Fellowship applications for the following academic year. For information write (well in advance of March 1) to The National Council on Religion in Higher Education, 400 Prospect Street, New Haven 11, Connecticut.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR

Its approach has been multi-faceted over the years. Yet from the beginning the Council has put emphasis upon the *quality* of the job to be done, and has pinned its faith upon *persons* rather than *programs*.¹ Thus its impact has been chiefly through individual leadership, in concrete situations, by persons whose training the Council has encouraged and helped to finance. The activities of Fellows have been diverse, spontaneous, loosely organized — and for this very reason their most worthwhile achievements are peculiarly difficult to describe in general terms.

Since 1924 an annual conference of the Fellows, known as the "Week of Work," has been an important part of the Council's regular activities. In 1949 our former president Patrick Murphy Malin* aptly characterized the Week of Work as "both scholarly and merry" — "a cross between a learned society meeting and a class reunion." No published reports of these conferences are prepared; but the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Week of Work (1949) led to the publication of a volume of essays by Council Fellows (*Liberal Learning and Religion*, edited by Amos Wilder; Harper, 1951). As a setting for intellectual interchange, friendly free discussion, and sustained personal relationships, the Week of Work has provided a focal point for the life of the Council since its inception.

In recent years, as the Council has grown in size and maturity, it has also initiated certain projects of a more "official" nature. One recent project led to the publication of *The Religion of the Hindus*, edited by Kenneth Morgan** (Ronald, 1953). As the preface states, "Recognition of the need for this book grew out of conversations with Fellows of The National Council on Religion in Higher Education . . . We decided that there is need for a book which sets forth the beliefs and practices of the Hindus, written by devout Hindus and designed for the Western reader who seeks a sympathetic understanding of Hinduism." The Hinduism project (including book, colored slides, and recorded music) was developed by the Council and financed by a grant from The Edward W. Hazen Foundation. Another proj-

ect, now under way, will supply an integrated pair of Biblical textbooks for undergraduate courses. In 1951, and again in 1953, we sponsored a Conference on Teaching Religion to Undergraduates. At these conferences, Fellows with considerable teaching experience worked with a group of young teachers and advanced graduate students — in an informal sharing of the problems and skills, the joys and woes, of the teaching profession. Currently we are making plans to develop a consultation service for colleges which are conscious of the need to evaluate their curricular and non-curricular religious program. These and other undertakings, sponsored by the Council from time to time, usually originate in such informal conversations as Kenneth Morgan mentions in the quotation above.

The Fellows of the Council now number 390. The employed staff consists of two — or, more exactly, one and a half: a part-time executive director plus an office secretary. This unbureaucratic organization operates on a modest budget (about \$35,000 apart from special projects) which is raised almost entirely by contributions from Fellows and from friends of the Council, including several foundations. Approximately two-thirds of the annual budget goes into Kent Fellowships. The major share of the administrative expense is carried by the Fellows, who make annual pledges according to their individual resources (after their graduate training is completed).

Our Directory of Fellows, and two Council pamphlets, are available free upon request if you wish more information.

You who read **THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR** may have already encountered individual members of The National Council on Religion in Higher Education, since their interests and activities are closely akin to yours. May I now suggest several ways in which you might relate yourself to the Council as an organization? — with, I hope, mutual helpfulness.

(1) *Nominations for Kent Fellowships* (see above). If you know an exceptionally fine student, at the top academically, with a vital religious concern about his vocation, send us his (or her) name, in this or future years, preferably by January.

(2) *Suggestions for projects*. If you have an idea (particularly a pioneering one) which it seems to you the Council might be equipped to implement, write to our office. It may be that we can explore it, make suggestions, or possibly develop a project for referral or for direct sponsorship.

(3) *Personnel*. We are not a placement agency; but in an informal fashion we are

¹President from 1939 to 1943. Formerly professor of economics at Swarthmore College, Mr. Malin is now executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union. The current president of the Council is Victor Butterfield, president of Wesleyan University (Connecticut).

²A Fellow of the Council since 1935, Mr. Morgan is chaplain at Colgate University.

REPORTS AND NOTICES

happy to suggest persons (both Fellows and others) for positions that come to our attention. We welcome letters from administrators wishing to find persons who combine "high religion and sound learning" (in Robert Calhoun's phrase) not only in the teaching of religion but in other disciplines as well.

These are the three points at which non-members can best help us to do more effective work.

In the decades since The National Council on Religion in Higher Education was founded, there have of course been some notable changes in American higher education with respect to religion. There have been related changes in the Council's con-

ception of its own role; but its fundamental faith, and its emphasis upon the personal factor, have been continuous and firm. Occasionally when the Council stops and takes a look at itself, we are amused by the incongruity of our ambitious name, or overwhelmed by the enormous job we face; but mainly we are deeply stirred by the job's excitement and significance. With all the peculiar "faults of our virtues" as an organization, we are convinced that what we try to do is immensely worth doing. And in these days we are heartened by the growing seriousness and alertness among those who share with us this urgent common task of strengthening and deepening American learning.

Contributors to the Reports and Notices Section

Paul L. Homer, already identified elsewhere, is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Minnesota, and currently on leave for studies in Denmark.

Elizabeth G. Wright is Executive Director of the National Council on Religion in Higher Education and engaged in a part-time post-graduate program in theology at Yale Divinity School. She was, until 1952, an in-

structor in Religion at Vassar College for three years.

(The report on developments among faculty members was written by the Editor, and is based upon materials in the files and correspondence available to him as a co-convenor of the University Commission and Director of the Faculty Christian Fellowship.)

The Visit of Dr.

Dr. Marjorie Reeves, Vice-Principal of St. Anne's College, Oxford, and a Lecturer of the University in Mediaeval History, will be the guest of the Commission on Christian Higher Education from June 15 until the end of September. A leader of the Student Christian Movement and active in its Don's Advisory Group from the beginning of its work to the present time, Dr. Reeves will make an excellent contribution of her insight and experience at a number of conferences and meetings this summer. Though her detailed schedule is not final at all points, she is expected to give leadership at such activities as the following: The Quadrennial Convocation of Christian Colleges, Denison University Granville, Ohio, June 20-24; Faculty Conference on Theology at Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, June 15-19; Conference of the Association of Presbyterian University Pastors, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky, June 24-28; Westminster Fellowship Assembly, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois, June 30-July 6; Seminar on Moral

Marjorie Reeves

and Spiritual Values in Public Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, July 7-13; Addresses at Columbia University and elsewhere in New York area, July 14-23; Institute of Independent Schools, Yale University, July 20; Consultation of the University Commission of the W.S.C.F., August 10-14; World Council of Churches' Assembly (and other engagements in area of Evanston, Illinois), August 15-23; Eastern-Southern Hazen Summer Conference, Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, August 24-30; Week of Work of National Council on Religion in Higher Education, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania, September 1-7; Student Assembly of the American Baptist Convention, Green Lake, Wisconsin, September 8-9. Faculty Consultations, in Northfield, Minnesota, Portland, Oregon, and California areas, September 10-22; Faculty Conference, Meredith College, Raleigh, North Carolina, September 23-26. Several specific dates are still being scheduled as this copy goes to press.

The International Perspective at the Quadrennial Convention of Christian Colleges

When delegations of about five representatives from two or three hundred Christian colleges in America meet for their first Convocation at Denison University, Granville, Ohio, from June 20-24, indications of a world context for the discussions will be present. At the first general session, Dr. Marjorie Reeves of Oxford University will address the Convocation on the subject, "The Christian College in the Western Educational World." The sixth general session will present Mr. M. M. Thomas, identified both with the Mar Thoma Church of South India and the World's Student Christian Federation's University Commission in Asia, who will speak on "The Christian College and the Eastern Educational World." Both of these special guests will be participants in other aspects of the week's program; Dr. Reeves will give the closing address on "The Christian in Education."

The general theme of the Convocation is "The Christian College and its Responsibilities in American Life Today." The Church Boards of Higher Education which constitute the Commission on Christian Higher Education are cooperating fully in this first major meeting of the country's church-related academic institutions. It is held under the auspices of the Commission. Its officers are Dr. John O. Gross, general chairman; Dr. Harlie L. Smith, seminar chairman; Dr. Hunter B. Blakely, section chairman; Dr. Ronald V. Wells, arrangements chairman; and, Dr. Raymond F. McLain, general director. Dr. Joseph R. Sittler, Professor of Systematic Theology at the Chicago Lutheran Theological Seminary, will be the Director of Worship, and Professor Royal F. Humbert of Eureka College will be the Director of Evening Prayers. Among the special lecturers are the following: Dr. Kenneth I. Brown, Executive Director of the Danforth Foundation; Professor Robert L. Calhoun of Yale Divinity School; Dr. Theodore A. Distler, Executive Director-elect of the Association of American Colleges; Dr. Howard F. Lowry, President of The College of Wooster; Dr. Albert C. Outler of the Perkins School of Theology; Dr. William G. Pollard, Director of the Institute of Nuclear Studies; and Dr. Roy G. Ross, General Secretary of the National Council of Churches. Complete programs of the Convocation and registration forms (the fee is \$3.00, and the total room and board cost is \$15.00 are available upon request from Dr. Raymond F. McLain, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, New York.

